

**THE MANAGEMENT OF THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS IN THE
DEPARTMENT OF HOME AFFAIRS: THE CASE OF TSHWANE AREA**

BY

PHATHELA JEREMIAH

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for

the degree of

MASTER OF ADMINISTRATION

In the subject

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

Supervisor: Mr Hlongwane Paulus

NOVEMBER 2017

DECLARATION

Student number: 44019742

I declare that **THE MANAGEMENT OF THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HOME AFFAIRS: THE CASE OF TSHWANE AREA** is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

.....

SIGNATURE

(MR PHATHELA JEREMIAH)

.....

DATE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor, Mr Hlongwane Paulus, who has shown profound commitment by guiding me from the outset in compiling this dissertation. Moreover, I am grateful for the support and expert knowledge that he offered me from the initial stages of my research proposal, which gave me a broader understanding of the research process. Throughout this research project, I felt honoured to be guided by a responsible man of his calibre in this academic journey. I will forever be grateful.

Furthermore, I would like to express my special gratitude to my wife, Vhutshilo, children Tshedza, Ifa, and Ndimma Makhadzi, for being patient with me while I was busy with this dissertation. I want you all to follow suit in the future. I hope you will be inspired by this dissertation. To my late father, Mr Frans Tshisikhawe Sekidikidi (Mushavhi wa nombe wa ha Mhani wa shavha, a sa shavhi mbudzi lukwembe, mulemba a no nga Thovhela, Muduhulu wa ha Phathela, Iwe Phathela wa tshekha, Phathela mphatele was sa mphatela ndi a pfuluwa, Mulungu, mulungulusi wa tshikoli tshiswa, Ishe nyankuwana) and mother, Maria Naledzani Phathela. You both played a vital role by educating me from childhood. Dad, you left me at the time when I was busy completing this dissertation and you will be dearly missed. I would have loved to share this dissertation with you. Nevertheless, thank you for what you have done for me.

Furthermore, I would like to thank the University of South Africa (UNISA) for awarding me financial assistance in the form of a bursary which made it possible for me to complete this study. I am also indebted to the Department of Home Affairs that also awarded me a bursary at the initial stages of my research journey. I also thank the editor of this document Mrs Marti Gerber for her professionalism and dedication in editing this dissertation.

Finally, my gratitude goes to the senior managers in the Department of Home Affairs for granting me the opportunity to conduct this research within their institution. Finally, I am thankful to all colleagues who gave me support and encouragement in the process of writing this dissertation. My special thanks also goes to my colleague Mr Maluleke Ntiyiso Ramsden who assisted me in doing the page numbering of this document, I sincerely salute you.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to explore the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisal in the Department of Home Affairs in Tshwane area. An understanding of the reasons for manager-subordinate conflicts pertaining to performance appraisal is essential in order to identify viable solutions for improving workplace relations and morale. In order to achieve the purpose of this study, a qualitative research design was adopted, whereby semi structured interviews were used to collect data. A sample of twenty five research participants was selected from five offices of the Department of Home Affairs in Tshwane area using a purposive sampling strategy. Qualitative content analysis was conducted to analyse data obtained through interviews and observations. The major findings of the study revealed that performance bonuses and biased ratings are the sources of conflicts or disagreements between managers and subordinates in relation to performance appraisals. Therefore, is recommended that the National Department of Home Affairs should expose both managers, supervisors and operational staff members to training and development to ensure an effective performance appraisal process. In addition, managers and supervisors should be equipped with necessary conflict management skills to resolve manager-subordinate conflict in the workplace.

Keywords: management, performance, performance appraisal, appraisal, process

ACRONYMS

CMC	Core Management Criteria
DHA	Department of Home Affairs
DPSA	Department of Public Service and Administration
GAF	Generic Assessment Factor
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
KRA	Key Result Area
LMX	Leader-Member Exchange
PMDS	Performance Management and Development System
PSR	Public Service Regulation
VDL	Vertical Dyad Linkage

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ACRONYMS.....	v

CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE	1
1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT, PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS	3
1.3.1 Problem statement	3
1.3.2 Research purpose	4
1.3.3 Research questions	4
1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	4
1.5 DERMACATION OF THE RESEARCH AREA	5
1.5.1 Geographical dimension	5
1.5.2 Hierarchical dimension	5
1.5.3 Time dimension	6
1.6 CONCEPTUALISATION	6
1.6.1 Management	6
1.6.2 Performance	6
1.6.3 Performance appraisal	7

1.6.4 Appraisal	8
1.6.5 Process	8
1.7 DELINEATIONS AND LIMITATIONS	8
1.8 SEQUENCE OF CHAPTERS	9
1.9 SUMMARY	9
 CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW – PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL	 11
 2.1 INTRODUCTION	 11
2.2 THEORIES UNDERPINNING PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL	11
2.2.1 Leader-member exchange theory	12
2.2.2 Meaning of leader-member exchange theory	12
2.2.3 Origins of leader-member exchange theory	13
2.2.4 The main assumptions of the leader-member exchange theory	14
2.3 DEFINITION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL	15
2.4 OBJECTIVES OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL	17
2.4.1 Evaluative objective	17
2.4.2 Developmental objective	18
2.5 LINKING PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL TO TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT	20
2.6 REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS GOVERNING PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN PUBLIC SECTOR	21
2.6.1 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa of 1996	22
2.6.2 Public Service Act 103 of 1994	22
2.6.3 The Public Service Regulations of 2001	22

2.6.4 White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997	23
2.6.5 Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council Resolution No 13 of 1998	24
2.6.6 Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council Resolution No 9 of 2000	25
2.6.7 The White Paper on Transforming Public Service Delivery of 1997	25
2.7 REASONS FOR FAILURES IN PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL	26
2.7.1 Unclear standards	26
2.7.2 Lack of objectivity	28
2.7.3 Rater's bias	28
2.7.3.1 Leniency or strictness	29
2.7.3.2 Central tendency	30
2.7.3.4 Halo effect	30
2.7.3.4 Horn effect	31
2.7.3.5 The recency effect	32
2.7.3.6 Contrast error	32
2.7.3.7 Spill-over effect	33
2.7.3.8 Prejudice	33
2.8 FREQUENCY OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL	33
2.9 REWARDING GOOD PERFORMANCE	34
2.9.1 Monetary reward	35
2.9.2 Non-financial reward	36
2.10 CONDUCTING THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL INTERVIEW	37

2.10.1 What is a performance appraisal interview?	37
2.10.2 Types of performance appraisal interview	38
2.10.2.1 Tell and sell	39
2.10.2.2 Tell and listen	39
2.10.2.3 Problem-solving	40
2.10.2.4 Performance is satisfactory – employee is promotable	40
2.10.2.5 Satisfactory – not promotable	40
2.10.2.6 Unsatisfactory – correctable	41
2.10.3 Steps of the performance appraisal interview	42
2.10.3.1 Prepare for the interview	42
2.10.3.2 State the purpose for the interview	42
2.10.3.3 Indicate specific areas of good performance	43
2.10.3.4 Invite participation	43
2.10.3.5 Focus on development	44
2.11 SUMMARY	44
 CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	 46
 3.1 INTRODUCTION	 46
 3.2 PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVE	 46
3.2.1 Interpretivism	46
 3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN	 48
 3.4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	 49
3.4.1 Research methods	50
3.4.1.1 Data collection technique	50

3.4.1.1.1 Interviews	51
3.4.1.1.2 Observation	53
3.4.1.1.3 Document study	54
3.4.2 Sampling	54
3.4.3 Data analysis and interpretation	57
3.4.4 Data quality criteria	57
3.4.4.1 Transferability	57
3.4.4.2 Credibility	58
3.4.4.3 Dependability	58
3.4.4.4 Conformability	58
3.4.4.5 Authenticity	59
3.5 RESEARCH ETHICS	59
3.5.1 Confidentiality	61
3.5.2 Right of privacy	61
3.5.3 Informed consent	62
3.5.4 Right not to be harmed	62
3.5.5 Anonymity	63
3.6 LIMITATIONS	63
3.7 SUMMARY	64
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	65
4.1 INTRODUCTION	65
4.2 SOURCES OF CONFLICTS BETWEEN MANAGERS AND SUBORDINATES	65

4.2.1 Inconsistent measurement of performance	65
4.2.2 Inaccurate performance measurement instrument	67
4.2.3 Invalid performance appraisal instrument	69
4.2.4 Perception of unfairness	70
4.2.5 Absence of constructive feedback	72
4.2.6 Situational factors	75
4.2.7 Unavailability of funds	78
4.2.8 Unclear performance standards and targets	79
4.2.9 Scarce resources	80
4.2.10 Appraisal timing and lack of evidence	80
4.2.11 Unbalanced distribution of tasks	81
4.2.12 Unclear performance agreement	82
4.3 THE INFLUENCE OF MANAGER-SUBORDINATE CONFLICTS	82
ON THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS	
4.3.1 Polarised relations between managers and subordinates	83
4.3.2 Poor morale	84
4.3.3 Delays in completion of performance appraisal process	84
4.3.4 Negative attitude towards the performance appraisal process	85
4.3.5 Lower/moderate ratings	86
4.3.6 Absenteeism	87
4.3.7 Poor cooperation	87
4.3.8 Negative bias and poor ratings by a supervisor	88
4.3.9 Lack of trust in the supervisor	88
4.4 SUMMARY	89

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	91
5.1 INTRODUCTION	91
5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	91
5.2.1 Research objective 1: Theoretical framework regarding performance appraisal	91
5.2.2 Research objective 2: Research design and methodology for understanding manager-subordinate conflicts	92
5.2.3 Research objective 3: Contribution on the sources of conflicts or disagreements between the managers and subordinates in relation to performance appraisals	92
5.2.4 Research objective 4: Influence of conflicts or disagreements on the performance appraisal process	96
5.3 DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMS	97
5.4 CONCLUSION	98
5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION	99
5.6 SUGGESTION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	100
5.7 REFERENCES	101

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Interview schedule for operational staff members
APPENDIX B	Interview schedule for supervisors and managers
APPENDIX C	Participant information sheet for operational staff members
APPENDIX D	Participant information sheet for supervisors and managers
APPENDIX E	Unisa ethical clearance letter
APPENDIX F	Permission letter from the National Department of Home Affairs

CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this study is to explore manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisal in the Department of Home Affairs (hereafter referred to as DHA) Tshwane area. Performance appraisal is a feature of a performance management system whereby employees are appraised by their immediate supervisors in order to improve performance. To a very large extent, as and when performance is being appraised by managers and supervisors respectively, there are conflicts that emanate from performance appraisal that eventually contribute to the ineffectiveness of the process and determine the inability of the institution to achieve its objectives.

In this chapter the background and rationale leading to the contextualisation of the problem are presented. Again, the research problem statement in relation to performance appraisal within the aforementioned department is concisely stated followed by the research purpose and questions. In addition to the problem statement, purpose and questions, the research objectives are also outlined. In order to provide a clear focus for the study, it is demarcated in terms of geographical, hierarchical and time dimensions. Important concepts in this study are defined in order to identify appropriate working definitions. The delineations and limitations of this research are presented in order to define and explain what has or has not been covered by this study and the reasons for it. The chapter concludes by outlining the sequence of chapters for the study.

1.2 BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

Performance appraisal as a feature of performance management system which became popular in the 1950's was alternatively referred to as merit rating (Armstrong, 2015:36; Radebe 2015:176). In contrast, Getnet, Jebena and Tsegaye (2014:178) argue that the "history of performance appraisal process can be traced back thousands of years". Performance appraisal was not regarded as a necessary process of management and therefore managers conducted it during an appraisal meeting (Armstrong, 2015:38; Armstrong, 2006:9). There were criticisms of the process of performance appraisal that emanate from its time-consuming nature. The notion of too much time spent was attributable to longer periods needed for the completion of forms that was exacerbated by the assumption of line managers that the system was irrelevant (Armstrong, 2015:38).

Performance appraisal is considered a time-consuming mechanism which ultimately amount to

conflict between supervisors and their subordinates (Paile, 2012:42). Therefore, the performance assessment period is regarded as a period of high tension between supervisors and subordinates. As a feature of the performance management system, performance appraisal was also used to evaluate international employees (Maley, 2009:1).

The process of performance appraisal came as a result of the introduction of the performance management and development system. As stated by Longenecker, Liverpool and Wilson (1988:311), the performance appraisal system is a critical component of the performance management system. Similarly, Sudin (2011:66) mentions that performance appraisal is an important human resource practice and tool dealing with training and development. Sudin (2011:66) concurs by stating that performance appraisal is an important human resource practice and tool dealing with training and development. In addition, Thurston and McNall (2010:201) maintain that performance appraisal is a practical tool for employee motivation and development.

Lussier (2006:279) describes developmental and evaluative performance appraisal. Developmental performance appraisal is helpful in making decisions and planning for performance, whereas evaluative performance appraisal helps institutions to make administrative decisions such as pay rise, demotions and service termination, transfers and promotions (Lussier, 2006: 279; Farazmand, 2007:320). On the other hand, Battaglio (2015:188) describes the functions of performance appraisal as employee evaluation and giving performance feedback. Therefore the purpose of performance appraisal is to develop and evaluate employees in order to help them improve their performance. In other words, the purposes of appraisal ranges from employee development dealing with training and personal development, administrative decisions dealing with merit, pay and career and institutional development which focus on personnel planning, prevention of conflicts, implementation of motivation system, and lastly documentation which deals with official regulations. In addition, Getnet et al (2014:182) present the three purposes of performance appraisal as the provision and regulation of employees with feedback, and to decide on individual merit. However, Armstrong (2015:39) totally disagrees by stating that performance appraisal evolved into management by objectives to do away with the merit rating and traditional appraisal schemes.

According to Ahmad and Bujang (2013:1), Kondrasuk (2012:117) and Sigh (2013:41) the term "performance appraisal" can also be called performance review, employee appraisal, performance evaluation or performance rating. Munzhedzi and Phago (2014:1083) however argue that performance appraisal or evaluation was introduced before performance management systems came into effect and was referred to as the system of second and third

notches. Lussier (2012:265) and Battaglio (2015:188) state that the performance appraisal process links the institution's mission, vision and objectives. According to Price (2011:223), performance appraisal can be conducted through self-assessment, peer assessment, line management, upward appraisal and 360 degree or multi-rater feedback.

Performance appraisal involves two key players, namely raters and ratees. The raters and ratees as the key players of performance appraisal refer to the institution's vision and mission when conducting the appraisal (Ahmad & Bujang, 2013:3). Similarly, Ayers (2015:170) agree that performance appraisal programmes should be aligned to the strategic plans in order to achieve key goals and objectives that help to increase institutional performance. In other words, performance appraisal is appropriate for institutions that depend on objectives and work performed by employees and therefore employees and management are expected to work together for the institutional objectives to be achieved. In this regard, there are five types of assessments as identified above (management by objectives; merit rating systems; payment by results; relative rating techniques and assessment centres) giving direction in terms of employees' job description. It is evident that the hierarchy of responsibilities restricts junior employees to assess their supervisors and therefore employees are assessed by those supervisors and managers they report to. Consequently, it is unusual for a manager to be assessed by a subordinate.

Performance appraisal is regarded as the backbone of employee development. More importantly, public sector institutions are vested with the responsibility to manage performance appraisal both efficiently and effectively in order to enhance employees' performance. Furthermore, manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements are inherent in the management of the performance appraisal process which impedes institutional objectives to be realised with ease. It is against this background that the focus of this study is on the management of the performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs in Tshwane area.

1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT, PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS

The following section highlights the problem statement, research purpose and questions.

1.3.1 Problem statement

The public sector institutions should have appropriate performance appraisal systems in place in order to formally assess individual performance (Erasmus, Swanepoel, Schenk, Van der Westhuizen & Wessels, 2005:268). In fact, Manyaka and Sebola (2012) argue that performance appraisal is essential as a tool for measuring, appraising and improving the work performance

of individuals within an institution. Despite the advantages of having performance appraisal systems in place, there exist manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements regarding performance appraisal within the Department of Home Affairs. Although the previous studies have emphasised the significance of performance management and appraisal, there is a lack of research pertaining to the sources of conflicts or disagreements between the managers and their subordinates in connection with performance appraisals.

According to Paile (2012:3), during the performance assessment period individual employees tend to experience a certain degree of unfair treatment and biasness when they are appraised by their managers. It is not yet known what the sources of these conceptions are. In this regard, Manyaka and Sebola (2012:10) assert that these challenges could be attributed to a lack of training, technical skills and inability to apply the performance appraisal systems correctly.

1.3.2 Research purpose

The purpose of this study is to explore the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisal in the Department of Home Affairs in Tshwane area.

1.3.3 Research questions

The focus of this study is on the management of the performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs in Tshwane area. In order to achieve the main purpose of this research, it is essential to answer the following research questions:

- Which theoretical framework is relevant for the understanding of performance appraisal within an institution?
- Which research design and methodology are appropriate for exploring the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisal?
- What are the sources of conflicts or disagreements between the managers and subordinates in relation to performance appraisals?
- How do these conflicts or disagreements influence the performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs?

1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The research objectives for this study are as follows:

- To explain the theoretical framework which is relevant for understanding performance appraisal within an institution
- To describe and explain the research design and methodology applied in exploring the

manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisal.

- To explore the sources of conflicts or disagreements between the managers and subordinates in relation to performance appraisals.
- To determine how conflicts or disagreements influence the performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs.

1.5 DERMACATION OF THE RESEARCH AREA

Research should be manageable so as to focus on a specific problem, considering available time, finance, sample size and also researcher's abilities (Brynard, 1997:11). In order to realise a clear focus, the following dimensions will be considered:

1.5.1 Geographical dimension

The geographical dimension of this research was selected as a focus area within which data could be collected to deal with the manager-subordinate disagreements or conflicts regarding to performance appraisal. In essence, the Tshwane area of the Department of Home Affairs was selected as an area of focus because it is accessible to the researcher. Again, the area in question has several districts and regional offices that are close to one another which make it easier for the researcher to collect relevant research data. Over and above this, the Tshwane area is more accessible to the researcher which makes it feasible for data collection at less cost.

1.5.2 Hierarchical dimension

The hierarchical dimension refers to categorisation, abstraction, and generalisation in order to develop an understanding of the hierarchical meaning of relations and to determine which of the criteria used are the most significant in relation to defining the difference (Boshomane, 2011:7). The study is to be undertaken at the regional and district level and the researcher interviews managers, supervisors and employees on salary levels six to twelve in offices where the highest paid official is on salary level twelve, if not the next official down the hierarchy and people below that salary level will be considered according to the institutional structure. The primary reason for selecting the afore-mentioned employees is to assist the researcher to have valid research findings because performance appraisal conflicts are perceived to be rife amongst them.

1.5.3 Time dimension

The study covers a five year period from 2011 to 2016. Time dimension can be explained well when the researcher has the time frame for the completion of the research study. In other words, the five year time frame makes it possible for the researcher to manage the research project within a reasonable time considering resource constraints. The next section deals with the conceptualisation of this research study.

1.6 CONCEPTUALISATION

The analysis of concepts and meaning of words pertinent to performance appraisal is considered. The purpose of a conceptual analysis is to clarify the key concepts and terminology in the statement of the research problem. The concepts that are to be used throughout the entire research study are defined below.

1.6.1 Management

According to Sikula (1976:3) management refers to the planning, controlling, staffing, leading, motivating, and decision-making activities performed by any institution in order to coordinate the varied resources of the enterprise, so as to bring about an efficient creation of some product or service. According to Van der Walldt and Du Toit (1999:11), management is a process whereby people in leading positions utilise human and other resources as efficiently as possible in order to provide certain products or services, with the aim of fulfilling particular needs and achieving the stated goals of the institution. In other words, institutions succeed due to the effective and efficient utilisation of resources which has to be managed promptly to avoid any misuse. Therefore management has to make resources available and accessible. These resources are computers, chairs, desks and printers which should be provided, whilst employees are referred to as human resources that should also be employed to achieve institutional objectives.

1.6.2 Performance

According to Baccal (2004:39) performance has to do with how well the employee's actions and behaviours contribute to the goals of the company and the work unit. Armstrong (2006:7) defines performance as the achievement of quantified objectives; it is not concerned with what people achieve, but how people achieve objectives. In this regard, employees should always abide by the institutional code of conduct and therefore behave in an ethical manner in the workplace. The behaviour of the employees determines the level of output that institutions generate.

1.6.3 Performance appraisal

Getnet et al (2014:181) define performance appraisal as a process by which a superior evaluates and judges the work performance of a subordinate. Lussier (2012:265) defines performance appraisal as the continuous process by which employee performance is evaluated. Munzhedzi and Phago (2014:1085) define performance appraisal as an element in the performance cycle of a performance management system that supervisors use to assess the performance of subordinates. Armstrong (2006:09) defines performance appraisal as the formal assessment and rating of individuals by their managers at an annual review meeting.

Performance appraisal involves the application of a system of measuring performance (Van der Walddt, 2004:40). Performance appraisal systems promote positive attitudes and practice that contribute to employee effectiveness (Anderson, 1993:57). According to Erasmus et al (2005:268) performance appraisal is a systematic process of identifying, observing, measuring, recording and developing strengths and weaknesses of employees. An effective performance appraisal system contains elements which include mechanisms to link individual goals and objectives to the strategic direction of the institution, a focus on targets and objectives, styles and behaviours to assess the individual performance in line with the organisation's preferred values and culture (Walters, 1995:67). Performance appraisal ensures that an employee's effort is successfully directed towards institutional priorities, through providing training and development within an institution. Singh (2013:41) and Kondrasuk (2012:115) describe performance appraisal as a conventional tool known as performance evaluation and merit rating which assesses and evaluates employee performance.

Armstrong (2006:09) defines performance appraisal as the formal assessment and rating of individuals by their managers at an annual review meeting. The process of performance appraisal is under the auspices of the human resource (HR) department rather than line managers. Performance appraisal is a process that is applied to all human resources. Erasmus et al (2005:109) argue that performance appraisal involves the assessment of the work performance of all employees at all levels. Torrington and Hall (1995:319) maintain that the process of performance appraisal requires that each line manager appraise the performance of their staff on an annual, six-monthly or even quarterly basis. As such, supervisors and managers are expected to hold meetings with the aim to assess the performance of individual employees and arrange for training and development that should be provided by a human resource department throughout a year, This would be the case if such a performance does not meet the

expected and required standards of an institution. Therefore, agreement must be reached to enter into a particular training intervention in order to meet institutional objectives and the supervisor should give reasons why training is significant.

1.6.4 Appraisal

“Appraisal is defined as a judging process with a high degree of subjectivity (Sudin, 2011:67 in Nathan, Mohrman and Milliman 1991)”. In this instance, appraising employees requires fair judgment. This can be achieved through discussing employees’ development and giving feedback on their job performance. It is for this reason that appraisal should give the appraisees the opportunity to reflect on their work in order to improve their performance.

1.6.5 Process

According to the English Oxford Dictionary, a process is a series of action or steps taken in order to achieve a particular end. Therefore, a process is something that happens on a continuous basis and is indefinite until the results are achieved. It is a sequence of eventualities that is never-ending and it happens continuously.

1.7 DELINEATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

The current research is limited to exploring manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements pertaining to performance appraisal from the selected DHA offices only, that is Akasia Regional office, Pretoria Regional office (Byron Place), Garankuwa (Odi) District office, Mamelodi Medium office and Soshanguve North Medium office. For the purpose of this study the researcher refers to them as DHA Tshwane Area in order to provide a clear focus. In fact, it is essential to explore the reasons for conflicts between managers and their subordinates in order to gain appropriate understanding of factors that may lead to such conflict situations during appraisal processes. Such an understanding may also help the managers to prevent or minimise the recurrence of similar situations. The limitations of the study become evident as the researcher does not include every employee to be part of the study, but only selected participants. The study covers a period of approximately five years, namely the period between 2011 and 2016. Therefore, only employees who have been in the employ of the DHA within the aforementioned period are considered for interviews, with the aim of obtaining valid data about the achievement of the research objectives which could in the end lead to valid research findings.

1.8 SEQUENCE OF CHAPTERS

CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background and rationale for the study which sets the scene for the problem statement. The research questions and objectives are outlined clearly. Subsequently, the demarcation of the study, description of main concepts, delineations and limitations of the study are presented.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW – PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

The second chapter explains the theoretical framework relevant for understanding performance appraisal within a public institution. Furthermore, the chapter focuses on the relevant and current argument in the literature pertaining to performance appraisal process.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The third chapter describes and explains the research design and methodology relevant to the study. In particular, this chapter presents the data collection methods and analysis utilised for exploring the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisal.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the discussion and findings relating to the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements during performance appraisal processes. Again, this chapter outlines either negative or positive research results that are found to be relevant to this investigation. Moreover, the chapter contains the explanation of the extent to which manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements influence performance appraisal processes within an institution.

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the major findings, conclusion and recommendations of the study. In fact, the chapter deals with the summary of the main findings. The recommendations consider the effective performance appraisal within DHA and seek to suggest a best possible way of managing employee performance.

1.9 SUMMARY

This chapter dealt with the introduction, background and rationale of the study with the prime objective of contextualising the problem. The chapter further discussed that performance

appraisal takes place through formal assessment and rating of subordinates by their supervisors or managers respectively at a review meeting held annually. The purpose of performance appraisal is to improve individual employees within an institution. It is evident that a supervisor cannot be assessed by a subordinate or any employee below his/her rank. Most significantly, the chapter demonstrated that the relationship between a subordinate and a manager is characterised by conflicts, disputes, misunderstanding and disagreements that are in opposition to the institutional goals and causes the appraisal to be much more complicated. The problem statement was narrowed down and subdivided into the research purpose and questions to avoid the study to become directionless. The demarcation of this research study was carried out by considering the fundamental dimensions for the realisation of a clear focus. The conceptual clarification was provided to prevent any possible misunderstanding that may exist in individual readers. Some of these concepts are expected to repeat themselves throughout the entire research study. The delineation and limitation of this study was explained in more detail. This chapter outlined the sequence of chapters for this study. The literature review is presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW – PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The Department of Public Service and Administration provides practical guidelines for the efficient and effective development and implementation of performance appraisal in order to manage employee's performance in the public sector. Appraising and managing employees' performance carries with it a sole focus directed towards attaining institutional objectives. Firstly, public sector managers has to outline what is expected of the employee which in most cases is listed on the employee's job description which is guided by developed standards of performance . Secondly, they have to appraise performance and discuss it in an appraisal interview. Moreover, performance that is entirely good is recognised by awarding performance incentives to more deserving employees. Public Sector employees are supposed to be rewarded for their good performance because of their effective and meaningful contribution towards public service delivery. Performance appraisal is underpinned by the leader-member exchange theory which regulates the interaction of employees and their supervisors in the employment relationships. The performance appraisal processes are doomed to failure if inconsistently applied by both managers and their subordinates. Consequently, the departmental activities and in particular the performance appraisals are largely informed by legislation and regulatory frameworks such as the Public Service Act 103 of 1994, The Public Service Regulations 2001, the South African Constitution, White Papers and collective agreements concluded by bargaining councils in the public service. The purpose of performance appraisal is two-fold, namely developing and evaluating employees' performance. While the previous chapter provided an overview of the dissertation in its entirety, this chapter discusses the theory that underpin performance appraisal, the meaning of performance appraisal, the objectives of performance appraisal, the linkage of training and development to performance appraisal, the Regulatory Frameworks governing performance appraisal in the South African context, problems related to the failure of performance appraisal, the frequency of performance appraisal, rewarding good performance and the conducting of performance appraisal interviews in order to establish a thorough understanding of the performance appraisal process that is implemented within public sector institutions from time to time. The next section deals with the theory underpinning performance appraisal which the researcher found necessary for this study.

2.2 THEORIES UNDERPINNING PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Performance appraisals have far-reaching consequences, should both supervisors and their

subordinates have good partnership cooperation. The partnership cooperation is explained well in terms of the leader-member exchange theory as discussed in 2.2.1.

2.2.1 Leader-member exchange theory

The leader-member exchange theory advocates that supervisors are not consistent in the way in which they interact with their subordinates which leads to their categorisation into "relatively high and low quality members" (Pichler, 2012:712). Subsequently, the high quality leader-member relationships consist of lower levels of "mutual support and trust" (Pichler, 2012:712). Likewise, subordinates with high-quality exchange produce high levels of task performance and contribute positively to the well-being of the entire institution through high institutional commitment and institutional citizenship behaviours (Wang, Law & Chen, 2008: 811). In contrast, Creary, Caza and Roberts (2012:539) are of the view that according to the leader-member exchange theory, low quality manager-subordinate relationships are underpinned by economic exchange of resources such as manager's mentoring and sponsorship in return for a subordinate's institutional citizenship behaviour. Sollinto, Martin, Dusic, Gibbons and Wagenhouser (2016:74) postulate that the leader-member exchange theory advocates that the workplace is characterised by many personal and professional benefits that employees can enjoy, depending on whether they have quality relationships with their supervisors. Moreover, Pichler (2012:711) regard the leader-member exchange theory as a contextual factor in performance appraisal where the leader-member relationship quality, supervisor trust and impression management are included in performance appraisal. Therefore, there is a close relationship between the leader-member exchange theory, relationship quality and supervisor trust. The next section discusses the meaning of the leader-member exchange theory.

2.2.2 Meaning of leader-member exchange theory

The leader-member exchange theory is a relationship-based dyadic theory of leadership (Erdogan & Baver, 2015:641). Accordingly, leadership resides in the quality of the exchange relationship developed between leaders and their followers. It deals with the quality of the exchange between leader and subordinate, while at the same time describing varying sub-dimensions or sub-contents of the construct (Schrieshem, Castro & Cogliser, 1999:76). Therefore, the leader-member exchange theory describes the existence of groups within institutions; it facilitates the relationship between two people, thereby prioritising leadership roles. Consequently, the leader-member exchange theory generates effective communication within groups. The main pitfalls reported about this theory are that discrimination against certain groups is very rife and that this theory fails to develop new emerging ideas of other individuals.

According to Liden, Erdogan, Wayne and Sparrowe (2006:724) the difference that the leader-member exchange theory makes to both individual and group performance, go unnoticed. In the leader-member exchange theory leaders more often than not treat subordinates unequally (Liden et al, 2006:724). The above authors argue that subordinates who enjoy high leader-member exchange relationship are more appreciated than those in lower leader-member exchange relationships, who are in turn exposed to difficult assignments, training opportunities, scarce resources, limited information and support. Employees with stronger relations with their supervisors are more effective on the job because they have high quality exchanges with the very same supervisors (Janssen & Van Yperen, 2004:368). Therefore, those subordinates who do not suffer from the discrimination of supervisors receive more resources than the rest of the remaining groups. The leader-member exchange theory is based on leader segregating or discriminating amongst group members and as such the reason for such discrimination remains largely unknown. In this regard, the leader-member exchange theory is relationship-based leadership which fosters and facilitate good employment relations. According to Haslam, Van Knippenberg, Platow and Ellemers (2003:140) the leader-member exchange theory is a major organisational psychology approach to leadership. The next section discusses the origins of the leader-member exchange theory.

2.2.3 Origins of leader-member exchange theory

According to Liden, Sparrowe and Wayne (1997:47) the leader-member exchange theory came into being in 1970 to give meaning to the social exchange theory and to fully understand the leader-member relationship. The authors further assert that the leader-member exchange theory is effective in assessing the relationship between leaders and their members. Van Breulen et al (2006:298) argue that the leader-member exchange theory was formerly known as the vertical dyad linkage (VDL) and the name was changed in the early 1980's. The authors maintain that this theory considers the way in which job responsibilities are carried out in order to attain institutional effectiveness. In contrast to this, Liden et al (2006:723) maintain that the development of the leader-member exchange theory was developed as an extension of the vertical-dyad linkage model which was based on the relationships of leaders and group members. According to the above authors, in order to maintain a quality relationship between supervisors and their subordinates, resources have to be made available and exchanged with the main objective to increase institutional performance, even though it is not stipulated in the employment contract for both parties. According to Deluga and Perry (1994:68), high quality exchange subordinates receive favourable performance appraisals, promotions, and support in career development as well as good positions. The next section deals with the main

assumptions underpinning the leader-member exchange theory.

2.2.4 The main assumptions of the leader-member exchange theory

The leader-member exchange theory deals with the importance of the relationship between a leader and his/her subordinate that should contribute immensely towards creating a better working environment (Van Breukelen, Schyns & Blanc, 2006:296). The leader-member exchange theory of leadership focuses on the two-way relationship (dyadic relationship) between supervisors and subordinates (Rowe & Guerrero, 2013:200). The theory postulates that leaders develop an exchange with each of their subordinates, and that the quality of these leader-member exchange (LMX) relationships influences subordinates' responsibility, decision influence, access to resources and performance. The relationship that a leader develops with each subordinate is commonly known as a vertical dyadic relationship and is subdivided into in-groups and out-group relationships (Rowe & Guerrero, 2013:201). The above authors are of the view that in-group relationships is characterised by mutual trust, respect, liking and reciprocal influence and it develops only when leaders and followers come together for a common goal. Champoux (2003:258) is in agreement when he states that the leader-member relationship includes the amount of trust between a leader and subordinates.

In-group members do more than what is expected and not only stick to achieve what is expected on the job description whereas out-groups members do only what is required of them. In-group members are given greater responsibilities, more rewards and more attention whereas out-group members are being undermined; they receive less attention and fewer rewards and are managed by strict rules and policies (Lunenburg, 2010:1). If a supervisor treats a subordinate as an in-group member, such a subordinate will in turn develop a high quality relationship with a subordinate but if a supervisor is an out-group member, he/she will develop a low-quality exchange relationship with this subordinate leading to employees' performance appraisals that are based on the supervisor's past interactions with the subordinate (Wang et al, 2008:1813). According to Deluga and Perry (1994:67) the higher to lower quality exchange is a result of a supervisor's limited time with subordinates and failure to attend to them consistently. In essence, leaders are expected to develop high-quality relationships with as many subordinates as possible and should also treat both the in-group and out-group members equally in order to achieve outstanding performance. Again, trust should be regarded as a major feature for managing supervisor-employee relationship. Managers should also recognise the good work that subordinates do on a daily basis. Accordingly, the leader-member exchange theory is grounded on the belief that there are differences in the quality of relationships between leaders and their subordinates which are related to positive institutional and member outcomes as well

as fewer work-related problems (Clemens, Milsom & Cashwell, 2009:75).

This theory promotes positive employment experiences and also augments institutional effectiveness. Leader-member exchange focuses on increasing institutional success by creating positive relations between the leader and subordinate. According to Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang and Chen (2005:421) leaders are expected to provide rewards to their followers who satisfy institutional expectations, whereas followers at the same time have the responsibility to refuse assigned roles that are difficult to fulfil. Leaders and their subordinates should negotiate rewards or recognition which is equivalent to their performance (Howell & Merenda, 1999:681). The leader-member exchange theory is hugely related to support and creating an atmosphere where subordinates increase their levels of job performance (Liden et al, 2006:724). According to Ross (2015:6) high quality leader-member exchange is concerned with increased subordinates' satisfaction level, autonomy and productivity, and decreased turnover intentions, increased benefits and quicker promotion rates, whereas low quality relationships are associated with negative work outcomes, including low job satisfaction and commitment, greater feelings of unfairness, lower performance and higher stress. As a result, the leader-member exchange theory assumes that leaders treat followers in a collective way as a group. It is underpinned by differences between leaders and their followers. The next discussion deals with the definition of performance appraisal.

2.3 DEFINITION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Erasmus et al (2005:268) define performance appraisal as a formal and systematic process by means of which the job-relevant strengths and weaknesses of employees are identified, observed, measured, recorded and developed. In contrast, appraisals are not done to identify poor performance only but also good results that make the appraisal systems job-related, practical and realistic (Werther & Davis, 1996:345). In this regard, job-related means evaluation of behaviours for job success that renders the whole system valid. A performance programme is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of a particular job. Similarly, performance appraisal is a formal, structured system for measuring, evaluating and influencing an employee's job-related attributes, behaviours and outcomes of an employee (Swanepoel, Botha & Mangonyane, 2014:2). Thorpe and Halloway (2008:75) argue that skills/attitudes and behaviours of the individual have to be considered because employees ought to be treated as valuable assets due to the fact that without them, there would never be any performance. Employees are valuable resources that should be trained and developed to improve communication levels that aim at strengthening performance appraisal (Bendix, 2007:687). Thorpe and Halloway (2008:72) state that performance management is about communication

through which a manager and an employee arrive together at an understanding of what work is to be accomplished, how work is progressing towards desired results and whether the performance has achieved the agreed upon plan. In this regard, recording and reporting progress on performance improvements should be done in a manner in which performance appraisal could be enhanced. The appraisal system should consider training and development but also give managers the opportunity to record and enquire the costs incurred when undertaking the training (Pattanayak, 2001:43). Officials are expected to report to two supervisors including line managers and project managers (Van der Walddt, 2016:199). Manyaka and Sebola (2012) argue that performance appraisal at an institutional level can be described as measuring, appraising and improving the activities of an institution including the activities of individual employees or groups to ensure the achievement of institutional outcomes. On the other hand, Armstrong (2006:9) defines performance appraisal as a formal assessment and rating of individuals by their superiors at a review meeting.

Performance appraisal involves the assessment of the work performance of all employees at all levels (Erasmus et al, 2005:109). In fact, as a developmental tool, performance appraisal develops an appraisal system, utilise the results of the appraisal data and design the performance appraisal system. Whereas Bekele, Shigutu and Tensay (2014:140) are of the opinion that performance appraisal has been defined as the process of identifying, evaluating and developing the work performance of employees in the institution This would be so that the institutional goals and objectives are more affectively achieved, while at the same time employees receive benefits in terms of recognition, receiving feedback, catering for work needs and offering career guidance. In essence, performance appraisal provides employees with performance feedback through an evaluation interview. Performance appraisal is the systematic assessments of an employee in terms of the performance aptitude and other qualities which are necessary for successfully carrying out the job (Getnet, Jebena & Tsegaye, 2014:177).

Getnet et al (2014:181) define performance appraisal as a process by which a superior evaluates and judges the work performance of a subordinate. In addition, Lussier (2015:265) defines performance appraisal as the continuous process that evaluates employee performance. Evaluation is based on employee's attitude towards the company (Stone 2008:615). Consequently, the manager has to evaluate employees' performance and thereafter communicate the results of the appraisal to them. Munzhedzi and Phago (2014:1085) define performance appraisal as an element in the performance cycle of a performance management system that supervisors use to assess a subordinate's performance. Performance appraisal is the formal methods by which an institution documents the work performance of its employees

(Shafritz & Russell, 2005:430). According to Pattanayak (2001:82), performance appraisal refers to all those procedures that are used to evaluate the personality, the performance, and the potential of an institution's group members. Furthermore, Mondy and Noe (1996:326) define performance appraisal as a formal system of periodic review and evaluation of individual's or team's job performance. According to Mathis and Jackson (2003:342), performance appraisal is the process of evaluating how well employees perform their jobs when compared to a set of standards, and then communicating that information to those employees. In the context of this study, performance appraisal is a government tool used by the public sector managers to evaluate employees' performance in order to increase performance levels required to achieve institutional objectives. The next section discusses the objectives of performance appraisal.

2.4 OBJECTIVES OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Erasmus et al (2005:109) postulate that performance appraisal serves three purposes which includes developing an appraisal system, utilising the results of appraisal data and designing the performance appraisal system. At the same time Grobler, Wärnich, Carrell, Elbert and Hatfield (2006:265) state that objectives of performance appraisal can be classified into two categories namely, evaluative and developmental objectives. Lussier (2006:279) identifies developmental and evaluative performance appraisal that are discussed below.

2.4.1 Evaluative objectives

Evaluative performance appraisal helps institutions to make administrative decisions such as pay raise, demotions and service termination, transfers and promotions (Lussier, 2006:279). The purpose of performance appraisal is to observe past performance to ensure thorough compensation based on merit increases and to allocate financial rewards such as wages, salaries and employee bonuses (Novit, 1979:140). In this instance, performance appraisal determines merit increases for the following year and also which employees are suitable for promotion. Secondly, staffing decisions is the other important evaluative objective of performance appraisal which enables supervisors to make grounded decisions regarding promotions, demotions, transfers and lay-offs (Battaglio, 2015:188, Anderson, 1993:13). Furthermore, performance appraisal serves to identify those employees suitable for promotion, transfer and for those whose services can be terminated (Pattanayak, 2001:84). In essence, evaluative performance appraisal helps institutions to make administrative decisions such as pay raise, demotions and service termination, transfers and promotions (Lussier, 2006:279). According to Mathis and Jackson (2003:344), promotion or demotion based on performance must be documented through performance appraisals. Again, performance appraisal is used to

evaluate the recruitment, selection and placement of staff (Grobler et al, 2006:266). Seotlela and Miruka (2014:180) describe performance evaluation as an annual or semi-annual event. Makamu and Mello (2014:107) state that measuring and evaluating performance requires competent supervisors and managers educated and trained in performance management. Public service comprises of managers with little understanding of how performance management works. Seotlela and Miruka (2014:180) argue that evaluating performance entails collecting performance data obtained through observation of behaviours. Moreover, it is further argued that performance appraisal deals with the evaluation of employee goal attainment and employee compliance with the shared values (Swanepoel, Botha & Mangonyane, 2014:2). Evaluative performance appraisal provides information to management regarding the justification of administrative actions dealing with the employee (Sanders, 1975: 9). Sanders (1975:9) identifies the purpose of evaluative performance appraisal as follows:

- To help in deciding who should be promoted, demoted, or given a raise in pay
- To uncover exceptional talents
- To furnish a basis for discharge of totally unfit employees
- To serve as a check on employment procedures generally and interviews and tests specifically

In essence, evaluation is necessary to guide managers as to how rewards are to be distributed.

2.4.2 Developmental objectives

Developmental performance appraisal is helpful in making decisions and planning for performance (Lussier, 2006:279). Performance appraisal develops employee skills and motivation and generates performance improvement in order for employees to retain more strengths than weaknesses (Stone, 2008:299). According to Grobler et al (2006:265) motivation of employees is increased by the receipt of performance feedback which informs them of any performance gap that needs to be remedied for future performance. Employee development entails discussion and identification of areas where an employee requires improvement (Sanders, 1975:8). According to Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015:125), if no improvement can be realised even after training has been provided, managers should consider redeployment of an employee to accomplish the duties and responsibilities that are in line with his/her capabilities. On the other hand, Van der Westhuizen et al (2011:289) argue that if there is no improvement in the levels of performance, particularly in the case of a manager, the manager should be discharged for unfitness or incapacity. With regard to employee's performance, Sangweni (2007:13) states that if the employee's performance does not improve during the time allocated,

a supervisor should arrange a final meeting with the employee and give an employee a written report on the outcome of the appraisal process outlining what needs to be done to overcome such a problem.

Moreover, performance feedback serves as a vehicle through which institutional objectives are met (Battaglio, 2015:188). The performance appraisal system promotes positive attitudes and practice that contribute to employee effectiveness (Anderson, 1993:57). As a result, the role of performance appraisal in enhancing employee effectiveness could best be described in terms of how employees identify their strengths and weaknesses in line with the expected performance (Pattanayak, 2001:84). In this sense, performance appraisal links individual goals and objectives to the strategic direction of the institution to assess the individual performance in line with the institution's preferred values and culture (Walters, 1995:67). Developmental performance appraisal is helpful in making decisions and planning for performance (Lussier, 2006:279). Performance appraisal improves performance of employees, sets performance targets and plans for achieving institutional objectives (Anderson, 1993:14). On the other hand, Roltades (1995:170) argues that performance measurement indicates where employees are improving but not to what level. According to Martin and Whiting (2003:143) performance appraisal identifies the developmental needs and career aspirations of employees. Therefore, the purpose of performance appraisal is to develop employees and help them improve their performance. The purpose of employee development as highlighted by employee development execute training programmes in order to eradicate weaknesses of workers that impact badly on their performance that also can only be realised after the allocation of work by their supervisors. For instance, the prime objective of offering training is to help employees improve performance, thereby improving their morale through meetings with their supervisors that seek to promote effective discussion of work related problems (Sanders, 1975::8).

Employee development should be aligned to reviewing past performance and conducting a skills audit in order to prepare and expose employees to any performance that in return prepares them to overcome any challenges that deters their promotion (Fisher, 1996:11). According to Wilson (1999:153), in order to achieve proper performance, each employee should know what is expected of him/her, whereas managers on the other hand should assist employees in any career-planning decisions and also assessing increases on new salary levels. Kanyane and Mabelane (2009:63) describe two forms of development, namely career development which involves performance related to promotion, and a development plan, which eradicates weaknesses emanating from poor performance. Furthermore, performance appraisal is used to retain quality employees and improve their performance (Holzer & Schwester, 2011:119). As a

matter of fact, performance development exposes employees to the training needs to improve performance and to develop their knowledge and skills (Armstrong, 2006:71). In this regard, developing performance entails increasing the capacity to perform through training which encourages good performance and strengthens job related skills and competencies. Armstrong (2006:9) argues that the entire performance management process of coaching, counselling, feedback, tracking and recognition encourage development. In this regard, the success of performance appraisal as a developmental tool is dependent upon the faithfulness of both a manager and an employee. It is for this reason that performance appraisal is undertaken to identify employee strengths and weaknesses and by providing regular feedback on a continuous basis and also identifying ways to improve performance. The next section provides a link between performance appraisal, training and development.

2.5 LINKING PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL TO TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

Performance appraisal ensures that an employee's effort is successfully directed towards institutional priorities through providing training and development within an institution (Walters 1995:67). According to Nel, Van Dyk, Haasbroek, Schultz, Sono and Werner (2004:426) training is a learning experience that changes employees' attitude, knowledge or skilled behaviour. Training has to be used as a behaviour change that enforces the acquiring of skills through learning (Novit, 1979:110). In this regard, learning is a behaviour change, the change in behaviour amount to the achievement of results from experience. If an employee gets promoted because of his/her conduct, the rest of the employees begin to realise the importance of behaviour in the workplace. Training and development equip public employees with knowledge and skills vital for managerial and leadership capacities (Battaglio, 2015:368, Erasmus et al, 2005:109). According to Erasmus et al (2005:269) performance appraisal determines where and when training and development should be made available should there be any identified fundamental weaknesses in performance levels of employees. Bendix (2007:444) argue that employees' performance should be monitored and they should also be given feedback pertaining to the way they perform. If they do not meet expectations, training should be provided. Training helps management to meet its human resources requirements (Nel et al, 2004:154). In other words, public sector institutions should improve the work performance levels of individual employees rather than to depend on and employ skilled workers of external sources in order to achieve institutional objectives.

The purpose of performance appraisal is to develop employees and help them improve their performance. Employee development discusses and identifies areas upon which an employee requires improvement (Sanders, 1975:8). Equally important, training of supervisors' could result

in accurate appraisals as opposed to unfair ratings that tremendously affect the employee morale and productivity that equally lead to poor compensation or staffing decisions (Grobler et al, 2006:267). Paile (2012) argues that performance appraisal training and re-training at the lower hierarchy should take place. According to Makamu and Mello (2014: 50) the identified training needs during quarterly review must be addressed for the improvement of performance. Similarly, an appraisal process identify the kind of training and development required by employees in order to improve current positions, be promoted or transferred to other positions (CCH Editorial Staff, 1988:11). Section 195(1) of the Constitution of South Africa makes provision for capacity development and training in the public service. In other words, training helps supervisors to understand their roles and provide them with tools for achieving sustainable institutional goals. It should focus upon setting clear outputs for subordinates and monitoring these in line with improving performance and productivity. The next section presents a regulatory framework governing performance appraisal in the South African public sector.

2.6 REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS GOVERNING PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN PUBLIC SECTOR

Performance appraisal in the South African public service occurs within regulatory frameworks that serve as a foundation that provides public sector institutions with formal appraisal systems. Van der Westhuizen et al (2011:268) state that there are regulatory frameworks and White Papers that underpin performance appraisal which include, the RSA Constitution of, 1996, the Public Service Act 103 of 1994, The Public Service Regulations of 2001, White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997, Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council Resolution 13 of 1998 and Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council Resolution No 9 of 2000.

2.6.1 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa of 1996

Section 195 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 makes provision that good human resource management and career development practices to maximise human potential must be cultivated. The Constitution further makes provision for effective performance of administrative functions (Van der Waldt & Du Toit, 1999:384). According to Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015:125) the South African Constitution provides also for the management of performance. It may also be argued that the Constitution is a guiding legal document that indicates a clear path to performance appraisal and how public sector employees are supposed to be appraised.

2.6.2 Public Service Act 103 of 1994

Section 3(5) (c) of the Public Service Act 103 of 1994 clearly indicates that performance appraisal should be provided in the public service (Van der Westhuizen et al, 2011:268). The Public Service Act stipulates that the head of a particular public service institution shall be responsible for effective management and administration which includes managing of employees' performance. Section 3(5) assigns to managers powers and responsibilities to develop the career of employees in terms of performance management and to institute disciplinary procedures (Sangweni, 2007:26). The Act also makes provision for the institution and administration of the public service of the Republic of South Africa, the regulation of the conditions of employment, terms of office, discipline, retirement and discharge of members of the public service based on poor performance (Van der Waladt, 2004:93). According to this Act, public managers as heads of departments are expected to perform the functions assigned to them, failure of which may amount to dismissal.

The performance in the public service institutions as stipulated by the Public Service Act, 103 of 1994 shall be managed in a consultative, supportive, and non-discriminatory manner in order to enhance institutional effectiveness, efficiency and accountability. According to Van der Waladt (2004:4) public service institutions should minimise the administrative burden while maintaining transparency and administrative justice. The aforementioned legislation outlines the responsibility of different parties in the process of performance appraisal including the executing authority (ministers in national departments or members of executive councils in provincial departments), senior management and the supervisors.

2.6.3 The Public Service Regulations of 2001

Part VIII of chapter 1 of the Public Service Regulations of 2001 provides that the executing authority should determine, in consultation with his/her department, a system that links individual performance to institutional goals. Part III of chapter 4 of the Public Service Regulations states that the performance of all members of Senior Management Service (SMS) should be managed through performance agreements (Van der Waladt, 2004:92). The Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA) mandated government departments to outline performance agreements of individual employees based on departmental strategic plans in order to measure institutional training priorities and individual training goals and objectives and the functional plans of the individual components. PMDS came into effect on 1 April 2001 and provided for performance assessment to take place on a quarterly basis (Van Dijk & Thornhill, 2003:465). As Erasmus et al (2005:280) explain, performance of an employee

shall be managed according to a performance agreement. An employee entering into such a performance agreement is also consenting to have his/her performance reviewed on a quarterly basis. Erasmus et al (2005:280) further state that the reviews may be verbal if the employee performance is satisfactory. According to Hendricks and Matsiliza (2015:127) the Public Service Regulations 2001 deal with performance assessments for all salary levels in the public service. The public service departments create opportunity for the signing of performance agreements. Part VIII of chapter 1 further stipulates that performance of all employees has to be assessed by a supervisor who determines an annual date for such assessment (South Africa, 2001). Part VIII.D.1 of the Public Service Regulations of 2001 makes provision that the public sector manager should make the outcome of the assessment known to employees whose performance is either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. In practice, where there is unsatisfactory performance, there should be a remedial action and a developmental support that is required from a senior public sector manager for the improvement of performance. Unsatisfactory performance is that kind of performance that does not meet the standard expected for the job. The Public Service Regulations 2001 serve as the guide to develop and implement performance appraisals and to determine a system that effectively manages employees' performance within public service departments.

2.6.4 White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997

As part of the transformation drive, the White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997 serves as the important instrument that seeks to eliminate the imbalances that led the public service to discriminate amongst other population groups (Van der Westhuizen et al, 2011:269). These disadvantaged groups (particularly black people) were exposed to unfavourable conditions that did not require them to occupy higher positions in the public sector. The White Paper describes principles that underpin performance appraisal which are results orientation; training and development; rewarding good performance and managing poor performance (Republic of South Africa, 1997). Results orientation depicts assessing of employee's performance in terms of Key Result Areas (KRAs) and Core Management Criteria (CMCs) for employees on salary level 8 to 12. Employees on salary level 3 to 7 are assessed against Generic Assessment Factors (GAFs). KRAs covers the main areas of work which account for 80% of the final assessment, while the CMCs/GAFs make up the other 20% of the assessment score (Cafrad, 2003:11).

Rewarding good performance carries with it a notion of a developmental nature that recognises outstanding performance (Republic of South Africa, 2009). Managing poor performance starts by a supervisor's commitment of identifying unacceptable performance of employees which

ends with giving resolution of such performances (South Africa, 2007:24). Performance management is an integral part of an effective human resource management that also serves as a comprehensive management framework which provides for the transformation of public finances, human resource management and development (Minnaar, 2010:34). The main aim of this White Paper was to establish a well-managed and competent workforce that is not only committed to delivering quality services but also to increase performance of public sector employees through training and development (Department of Public Service and Administration, 2007:2). Naidoo and Kuye (2005:619) posit that “service delivery requires an improved performance by public servants”. Manyaka and Sebola (2012:307) also argue that the management of employee’s performance focuses more on improving public service delivery. As required by the Home Affairs Departmental Policy, supervisors/managers develop the performance development and improvement plans after every quarterly performance assessment, thereafter they are expected to submit quarterly reports on performance development and improvement interventions that have been implemented (DHA Integrated Performance Management and Development Policy for Non-SMS Members, 2009:15). According to the White Paper on Human Resource Management, the success of the public service in achieving its goals is embedded in the efficiency and effectiveness of employees’ performance.

Through performance management the public service can produce better results and also meet the needs of the general public who public servants are mandated to serve. Every employee's performance is assessed at least once annually to identify strengths and weaknesses in order to recognise, reward and manage poor performance (South Africa, 1997). Chapter 5 of the White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997 stipulates that managing performance carries with it the expectations of employers from each individual employee, the manager’s confidence in whether or not the employee’s performance is in line with the institutional goals and the ability to improve poor performance. Furthermore, the aim of the White Paper on Human Resource Management in the Public Service of 1997 is also to develop human resource management practices in order to modernise the public service (Van der Waltd, 2016:386).

2.6.5 Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council Resolution No 13 of 1998

The Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council Resolution No 13 of 1998 (Republic of South Africa, 1998) sets a framework for senior managers to follow the individual performance agreement. Public service departments are expected to outline performance agreements of individual employees based on the departmental strategic plan in order to measure institutional

training priorities and individual training goals and objectives and the functional plans of the individual components (DPSA, 2007:10). According to Public Service Regulation 2001, performance of any person appointed to a senior management post is managed in terms of a performance agreement. This resolution makes provision for performance agreements to include key duties and responsibilities, timeframes for performance targets and review, dispute resolution mechanisms and the programme for managing performance and salary increases (Erasmus et al, 2005:272). Armstrong (2006:70) maintains that performance agreement outlines how performance will be measured and offers results of performance planning. A performance agreement has to be signed before the end of the first quarter and is composed by employee data, a workplan and a personal development plan (DPSA, 2007:11). In other words, employee data should reflect the employee's personnel number, job title and the level occupied; a workplan consists of the Key Result Areas (KRAs), whereas a personal development plan identifies the employee's strong and weak areas of performance that need to be improved.

2.6.6 Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council Resolution No 9 of 2000

The Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council Resolution No 9 of 2000 (Republic of South Africa, 2000) regulates the salary increases of employees whose performance is above average (Erasmus et al, 2005:272). According to Van der Westhuizen et al (2011:270), this Resolution deals with the structuring of remuneration packages that employees receive upon reaching pensionable age. The Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council Resolution No 9 of 2000 further empowers Senior Management Services (SMS) to exercise their rights to resolve disputes emanating from performance appraisal in terms of dispute resolution procedures.

2.6.7 The White Paper on Transforming Public Service Delivery of 1997

Chapter 13 of the White Paper on the Transformation of Public Service Delivery of 1997 (Republic of South Africa, 1997) stipulates that human resource development should put an effective appraisal systems in place that focus on staff training and the use of incentives to reward individual and team performance, employees' promotion and career advancement on performance. Government departments should manage performance in a consultative, supportive and non-discriminatory manner (Mlambo, 2010:63). The next section deals with reasons for failures in performance appraisal.

2.7 REASONS FOR FAILURES IN PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

There are various potential pitfalls that are encountered by managers when conducting performance appraisal and that lead performance appraisal to failure (Middlemist, Hitt and Greer, 1983:314). According to Kondrasuk (2012:115) there are very common in performance appraisal, like problems with determining the purpose and goals of performance appraisal, problems involving the participants in performance appraisal, problems involving what is measured and how it is measured and lastly, problems with the basic system and the process of performance appraisal. On the other hand, Grobler et al (2006:264) are of the opinion that a negative working culture, lack of follow-up of performance reviews, over-emphasis on the appraisal aspect of development, inadequate performance information and inadequately maintained objectivity are the major reasons why performance appraisal fail. At the same time, Nankervis et al (1999:393) identify a lack of top management support, a lack of job-relatedness standards, rater bias and too many appraisal forms to complete as stumbling blocks of the performance appraisal process. Erasmus et al (2005:273) raise the following reasons of performance appraisal failures:

- technical issues in the system itself (choice of format and administrative procedures; purposes for which it is designed)
- Human issues related to the interaction process between supervisor and subordinate.

In this regard, Fisher (1996:136) says that performance appraisal fails due to problems in making judgements about people, lack of skill in conducting performance appraisal discussions and difficulties in identifying the criteria for evaluating performance. Additionally, Tyson (2015:195) states that performance appraisal suffers from problems in relation to reliability and validity.

2.7.1 Unclear standards

The main problem upon which performance appraisal suffers from is inconsistent standards that people find difficult to define (Nel et al, 2004:482). According to Liff (2011:139) performance standards are the key component of the appraisal plan which needs to be aligned with institutional goals. In addition, performance standards are the key tasks or objectives of the department which are expected to be achieved by employees (Tyson & York 1996:60). Performance standards measure the performance of employees and have to be aligned to institutional goals in order to conscientise employees on what to achieve (Liff, 2011:139). Similarly, performance standards are expected to be achievable and should be agreed upon

with each individual employee (Erasmus et al, 2005:373). Performance standards should be made clear and known to avoid a high volume of disputes that becomes prevalent in the workplace.

Kirkpatrick (2006:49) states that standards of performance have to be clarified to make employees aware of what is expected of them. In contrast, Novit (1979:109) argues that during tight labour markets, public sector managers have to lower the standards so that they can be easily achievable. Mathis and Jackson (2003:341) state that realistic, measurable and clearly understood performance standards benefit both institutions and employees. In essence, performance standards have to be clearly defined and communicated to all employees but also be based on job-related requirements (Nankervis, Compton & McCarthy, 1992:390). Furthermore, Lussier (2003:250) maintains that a manager has to ensure that employees have to know what the standards are and clarify them in order to minimise disagreements over performance during formal performance appraisals. In other words, after the work has been performed, the supervisor appraises the performance followed by a collective effort of both the supervisor and the employee who then reviews work performance against established performance standards. Moreover, performance standards determine whether or not the objectives are achieved. Performance standards must be expressed in terms which are relevant and easily understood (Republic of South Africa, 1997). Erasmus et al (2005:277) add that performance standards provide details about the worker action or output that will be assessed, the criteria to be used for the assessment and the way in which performance will be measured. As a matter of fact, clear and fair standards of performance enable institutions to make a thorough decision as to which employees are to be promoted based on quality output (Pattanayak, 2001:91). Therefore, performance standards should be simple and straightforward to be achieved by employees. In other words, employees should be exposed to standards with which they can comply.

Performance appraisal should evaluate the employees in accordance with the predetermined work requirements to determine whether or not employee has done well (Grobler et al, 2006:267). Equally important, performance appraisal should establish performance and job standards which describe the conditions for totally satisfactory performance (Erasmus et al, 2005:277). As pointed out above, performance standards are expected to be achievable and should be agreed upon with each individual employee (Erasmus et al, 2005:373). According to Manyaka and Sebola (2012:303), the reason why there is poor performance is because of the established standards for performance and how these standards are applied. In other words, standards are based on job analysis records and the employee's performance is inseparable

from those standards. These standards are set by senior managers in order to measure both institutional and employee performance and have to be aligned to institutional objectives. If standards are not met, institutional objectives are hardly achieved by employees. Consequently, standards vary depending on which institution they are applied.

2.7.2 Lack of objectivity

Performance appraisal lacks objectivity in terms of the rating scale method which makes its factors such as attitudes, loyalty and personality difficult to measure (Bekele, Shigutu & Tesay, 2014:142). According to Pattanayak (2001:105), the fact that there is a lack of objectivity, makes appraisal difficult to measure as well. Lack of clear goals and objectives depicts the inability of public managers to make institutional goals known to all employees (Manyaka & Sebola, 2012:306). According to Markus (2004:2), performance appraisal fails to provide set clear goals. Objectives are made clear during the planning phase in order to ensure that employees understand what is expected from them (South Africa, 2007:14). In this regard, all these factors contribute negatively to employee's job performance.

2.7.3 Rater's bias

Rater's bias is the inaccurate distortion of a measurement (Werther & Davis, 1996:348). Rater's bias is reflected in instances where raters intentionally amend the rating scores of unfavoured employees and give higher ratings to his/her friends (Bekele et al, 2014:142). Stone (2008:308) argues that rater bias results in unfair and inaccurate ratings. In addition, the distortion of a particular rating is sometimes influenced by hatred towards a particular ethnic group (Mathis & Jackson, 2003:360). On the other hand, effective performance appraisal should be free from any form of bias to reduce any unfairness (Ahmad & Bujang, 2013:1). Raters may be biased and have a negative perception about a person to be rated because of that person's sex, colour, caste, religion, age, style of clothing and political view which have a negative impact on performance appraisal (Pattanayak, 2001:92). On the other hand, Leap and Crino (1993:14) are of the view that factors such as personal lifestyles, political beliefs, race, age, religion should be ignored when performance is being appraised. Supervisor's beliefs, values and prejudices determine how an employee is appraised and therefore supervisors are warned against allowing those beliefs and values to dominate the performance appraisal process (Middlemist, Hit & Greer, 1983:315). On the other hand, evaluators are more often than not criticised of being biased due to their giving satisfactory appraisals to non-deserving employees (Kondrasuk, 2012:119).

Makamu and Mello (2014:108) argue that performance appraisal is at stake if raters are

improperly trained and are vested with the responsibility of rating employees which in turn complicates performance management evaluation. Boachie-Mensah and Seidu (2012:75) identify the rater effect which they define as the appreciation of the subordinate by the superior which results in the subordinate getting higher scores that emanates from his/her close proximity and the reluctance of the superior to punish subordinates whenever they under-perform.

Sebashe and Mtapuri (2011:326) regard performance appraisal as unsupportive and conducted in a biased manner. Similarly, Makamu and Mello (2014:108) argue that performance appraisal is at stake if raters are not properly trained and are vested with the responsibility of rating employees which in turn complicates the entire appraisal process. The rater's bias is associated with the appreciation of the subordinate by the supervisor which makes him or her get higher scores that emanates from their close proximity. There is also a reluctance on the part of the superior to punish such an employee after the commission of a wrongful act or if there is under-performance. Raters should be cooperative to tackle whatever performance related problem exists because the performance appraisal process requires adequate training and avoid biasness (Makamu & Mello, 2014:108). In this sense, supervisors should be exposed to counselling to deal with a problem of biasness towards their subordinates or employees (Nel et al, 2004:484). Therefore, if performance appraisal is biased it means that it caters only for the needs of a certain group of employees and as a result is not effective enough to bring better results. Biasness manifests itself in many types of behaviour such as leniency, the recency effect, the halo or the horns effect, central tendency and prejudice (Ahmad & Bujang, 2013:6). Performance appraisal is dysfunctional should rating be affected by national origin, age, sex, race, religion, physical characteristics and manner of speech. Therefore, false assumption rather than facts influence the evaluation and assessments processes.

2.7.3.1 Leniency or strictness

Leniency is giving undeserved high ratings to avoid misunderstanding (Bekele et al, 2014:142). Inexperienced supervisors tend to appraise performance too leniently by rating employees highly in order to gain popularity (Nel et al, 2004:484). Those employees who receive the high scores for performance appraisal consider the system as effective and efficient and therefore perceive it positively. Employees with a positive perception are more motivated to accomplish their task whereas those who have a negative perception consider the system as biased; thus not properly implemented and not an appropriate way to evaluate an employee's perception towards work performance (Gabris & Mitchell, 1989).

Moreover, high scores that supervisors give to employees are because of the friendship they share that results in the reluctance to punish under-performers (Boachie-Mensah & Seidu, 2012:75). Therefore, leniency is influenced by the inability of the manager to convince subordinates to maximise performance and to insist that a particular rating is deserved. In fact, leniency involves the tendency of a rater to exaggerate the performance of a ratee which results in a ratee being rated higher than his/her actual performance. At the same time, strict raters do not rate employees high enough and as a result rating is not in accordance with performance, as it is lower than expected (Radebe, 2015:177). According to Mathis and Jackson (2003:360), a leniency error occurs when ratings of all employees are similarly higher than expected. In addition, the strictness of a manager may subject employees to lesser pay rises, promotions and discrimination (Mondy & Noe, 1979:338). Decenzo and Robbins (1999:10) argue that training of appraisers can diminish common mistakes such as the halo effect and leniency, because supervisors can practice observing and rating behaviours.

2.7.3.2 Central tendency

Central tendency is committed when an average rating is given to all employees (Mathis & Jackson, 2003: 360). Raters find it very difficult to evaluate employees higher or lower. The reason why they opt for central tendency occurs when they are not familiar with the work of their subordinates or if they have limited supervisory ability (Nel et al, 2004:484). In this regard, raters put their marks at the centre of the rating sheet which is sometimes accompanied by recommendations by the human resources department to request a written justification of extremely higher or lower ratings (Wether & Davis, 1996:348). Stone (2008:309) contends that a satisfactory performance rating could be perceived as negative, which could affect the employee's commitment and as a result it does not serve any purpose in terms of reward, training and development. In contrast, appraisers are required to provide reasons for both poor and outstanding performance rather than subjecting employees to a normative rating or assessment (Pattanayak, 2001:91). In other words, managers' inclination to rate all or most of the employees or interviewees as average, demoralises good performers. In this regard, the disadvantage of the central tendency is that even poor performers are found to be benefiting from this kind of an approach although they do not qualify for such average rating.

2.7.3.3 Halo effect

The halo effect occurs in instances where a manager gives higher ratings and scores in one area where optimum performance is achieved by a particular employee (Mathis & Jackson, 2003:57). McGuire (2014:134) maintains that employees who are supported usually have higher

levels of employee commitment and have higher performance levels. On the other hand, high scores that supervisors give to employees can be because of the friendship between them that results in the reluctance to punish under-performers (Boachie-Mensah & Seidu, 2012:75). Furthermore, an average work performance of a particular employee can be replaced by a higher rating, should that employee show an outstanding performance in any sporting activity (Pattanayak, 2001:91). The replacement of a particular rating from low to high should be based on a factor, for example neatness which is used in an institutional performance appraisal system (Mondy & Noe, 1996:339). The fact that an employee is liked or disliked by the appraiser may have a detrimental effect on his/her assessment (Torrington et al, 2009:395). To clarify this issue, the manager tries to be consistent by generalising and gives one higher rating for a deserving employee known to every employee.

Furthermore, Holbeche (2005) adds that a more common approach that managers use to avoid dealing with poor performance is by giving an average performance rating, which is not the true reflection of the employee's performance during the evaluation period. Poor performers are considered as those employees with poor attendance records regardless of the quality or quantity of results being produced, whereas those employees with good attendance records are considered as intelligent and responsible (Stone, 2008:309). The halo effect is about rating employees satisfactory in all areas without looking at the ability that each employee has in terms of adding value through the development of higher skills to a particular institution (Nel et al, 2004:483). Kirkpatrick (2006:50) argues that the halo effect is the tendency of the manager to overrate a favoured employee due to the effect of a past record, compatibility, effect of recency, the blind-spot effect, the high potential effect and the no-complaints bias. The halo effect occurs when a rater's personal opinion of the employee influences the measurement of performance (Werther & Davis, 1996:348). In other words, quality is not considered when appraising performance and as such favouritism plays a role in the halo effect, because the rating given is influenced by whether or not the employee is well known by the appraiser. This poses a major problem to the overall performance appraisal process. A rating of unsatisfactory performance on one quality may influence a lower than deserved rating elsewhere, such as rating someone low because the manager does not like an employee's personal style. In this regard, failure to allocate a fair rating in one area may negatively influence an overall rating of individual employees.

2.7.3.4 Horn effect

Supervisors should refrain from making comparisons of subordinates' performance with "what they did" in the past (Pattanayak, 2001:91). The manager generalises the negative performance

of one employee by giving same negative rating to all employees. Moreover, if the manager may generalise on the positive performance of one employee, he/she may be tempted to apply the pass-one-pass-all approach when managers use it as a reward tool and thus disregard its developmental purpose (Manyaka & Sebola, 2012:302). Based on the above contentions, it is of the utmost importance for institutions not to adopt these two approaches, namely the halo effect and pass-one-pass all approach. With the former approach; the appraisal may be used as a punishing tool which demotivates the rest of the employees who deserves a higher rating as a result of one poor performer. In this regard, managers should start rating good performers appropriately so that good and excellent performers could benefit from it. In this way, poor performers will not unfairly or indirectly benefit from the hard working employees within an institution.

2.7.3.5 The recency effect

The recency effect is the use of subjective performance measures based on the employee's most recent actions which plays a role during rating (Werther & Davis, 1996:349). A job well done can be replaced by any poor or average performance for the entire year (Kirkpatrick, 2006:50). This means that raters are influenced by the employee perception of performance to make a decision (Nel et al, 2004:484). The manager exaggerates the employee's latest behaviour because he/she complies with institutional rules and policies only during appraisal periods. They could also come to work earlier and leave late for a specific purpose (Stone, 2008:310). Similarly, Pattanayak (2001:91) maintains that the manager forgets about the employee's disturbing behaviour that was so problematic throughout the year. In other words, managers are expected to be vigilant for this type of behaviour by ensuring that there is a real dramatic improvement in all the levels of performance, because after a good rating has been allocated, chances are that the employee's performance could deteriorate to zero improvement. Thus, the recency effect does not promote freedom of expression because employees who openly give their views are being victimised.

2.7.3.6 Contrast error

Contrast error is the tendency of the manager to rate an employee determined by how another employee has been rated, rather than against performance standards (Mathis & Jackson, 2003:360). According to Erasmus et al (2011:273) an average performer receives a poor rating should he/she be the next best performing employee. The contrast error places a manager in an awkward position because he/she encounters difficulties when there are some contentious issues on the part of the employees (Kirkpatrick, 2006:51). In this regard, performance should

rather be measured against job requirements as opposed to other people's rating.

2.7.3.7 Spill-over effect

Past performance is mostly equated with current performance, which amounts to rating scores to be transferred from past to the latest performance appraisal (Pattanayak, 2001:92). Managers tend to equate past performance with current performance (Kirkpatrick, 2006:50). In this regard, the performance appraisal interview is not adequately utilised to fulfil its sole purpose.

2.7.3.8 Prejudice

Prejudice towards an individual or a group should be avoided by a manager because it causes performance appraisal to fail to a large extent (Stone, 2008:310). According to Torrington et al (2009:394) prejudice of the appraiser towards the appraisee may cause the rating scores and the judgement to be altered. Werther and Davis (1996:349) argue that sometimes this prejudice that raters have is unintentional, which makes the biases difficult to change. The frequency of performance appraisal is considered in the next section.

2.8 FREQUENCY OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Performance appraisal takes place once every year and should be conducted to appraise managers, professional, administrative, technical and support staff (Fisher, 1996:176, Armstrong, 2006:9). On the other hand, Boxall, Purcell & Wright (2007:365) are of the view that performance appraisal is done at discrete time intervals. However, the intervals (i.e. every six or twelve months) of performance appraisal should not distract employees from their responsibilities (Novit, 1979:150). Contrary to this view, Van Dijk and Thornhill (2003:465) state that performance appraisal should take place on a quarterly basis. Furthermore, Torrington et al (1995:319) maintain that the process of performance appraisal requires that each line manager appraise the performance of their staff on an annual, six-monthly or even quarterly basis. According to Camardella (2003:103), performance appraisal should be on-going throughout the year as this would help in making employees aware of their performance periodically. In this regard, performance appraisal should be about what is already known by employees regarding their performance.

Performance appraisal should thus be conducted on a regular basis; this means either every six or twelve months (Novit, 1979:150). As stipulated in the Public Service Regulations of 2001, the employee's supervisor shall monitor the employee performance on a regular basis and give the employee feedback on her or his performance at least four times a year. If however the

employee is not happy with the assessment results he or she may refuse to sign (Republic of South Africa, 2001:28). Baccal (1999:110) argues that performance appraisal merely refers to a meeting held annually by managers and employees to deliberate on success and problems encountered throughout the year and to apply problem-solving mechanisms to overcome the obstacles. This suggests that supervisors should prioritise discussing the appraisal with their employees to determine specific areas where they reach agreement and disagreement (Grobler et al, 2006:267). It does not matter whether the performance appraisal is conducted annually or semi-annually, as long as the newly appointed staff can be accommodated into the appraisal process before the end of the probationary period (Mondy & Noe, 1996:333). In other words, discussion sessions help supervisors to identify those performance areas of employees that need improvement and whether they have exceeded institutional expectations. Therefore, the advantage of regular appraisal is to help facilitating control and monitoring of supervisors in terms of the performance of expected tasks. The next section concentrates on the need for rewarding good performance.

2.9 REWARDING GOOD PERFORMANCE

According to Erasmus et al (2005:285) performance-related rewards and benefits are determined by the signing of an annual performance agreement based on the outcome of the performance appraisal. Good performance requires to be developed whereas poor performance requires retraining of the employee concerned (Werther & Davis, 1981:342). Managers have to apply corrective measures for poor performance which is supposed to be subjected to a performance development plan to improve employee performance (Hendricks & Matsiliza, 2015:129). In this sense, the expectations of employees tend to be satisfied successfully when they receive an increase in wages, whereas the employer's satisfaction is maximised when institutional goals are reached. Rewards that employees receive for their contribution to an institution do not only have implications for their motivation, but also have an impact on the recruitment and retention of talented employees (Price, 2011:265). As a matter of fact, it is essential to offer both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards in order to enhance performance and production (Kanyane & Mabelane, 2009:67). The reason for rewarding good performance is to encourage good performers to maintain the high standard they have achieved and also to encourage others to strive for improved performance. Performance rewards involves the awarding of performance bonuses for both senior public sector managers and other employees in the public service (Erasmus et al, 2005:290).

Erasmus et al (2005:289) identify three ways of giving recognition to good performance, namely, pay progression, performance bonuses and non-financial rewards. Rewarding good

performance is explicitly reflected in the manner in which reward is directly linked to performance. According to the Public Service Regulations (2001) performance rewards may only be granted to SMS members who have completed an assessment period of at least 12 months and those who have performed significantly above expectations. Makamu and Mello (2014:79) also state that employee performance rewards are based on evidence of the contribution made by employees towards the accomplishment of goals according to the employer's expectations. The Department of Home Affairs has developed and implemented an integrated reward and recognition strategy focusing on service excellence, top performers and long service in order to motivate employees and thereby enhancing performance and improving productivity (Department of Home Affairs, 2013: 42). Pattanayak (2001:232) states that reward within the context of performance appraisal is in the form of both monetary reward and non-financial reward. Part VIII of chapter 1 of the Public Service Regulations stipulates that the executing authority may offer any non-monetary reward or monetary reward (cash) to any employee.

2.9.1 Monetary reward

Monetary reward is commonly known as intrinsic reward (Williams, 1998:184). Monetary reward refers to pay or earnings, basic pay, wages or salary as well as bonuses (Wilton, 2011:217). According to Kanyane and Mabelane (2009:63) the intrinsic reward of being recognised for the good work that has been performed is a very powerful and effective motivation tool. Mabindisa (2013:53) states that a marketable salary is to be paid to employees and therefore the attainment of goals should be accompanied by a reward. The payment referred to above is subject to the provision of records and evidence that proves whether a job has been done satisfactorily. The provision of records and evidence is fundamental to employee performance rewards in the public service. Makamu and Mello (2014) state that employee performance rewards are based on evidence of contribution made by employees towards the accomplishment of goals according to the employer's expectations. Moreover, a government performance payment is referred to as pay for performance which is also known as pay for contribution or pay for competence (Nicholas, 2007:250). Again, the manner in which a performance bonus is allocated raises many questions to employees who do not receive the annual performance bonus as they believe they deserve to get. Munzhedzi (2011:25) argues that performance bonuses and pay progression alone can never be sufficient to encourage good performance, but also acknowledgement of good performers in the public service by the leadership or management. Employees usually experience biased performance assessments, low morale, discrimination and unfair treatment which prevails mostly during performance

assessment periods (Paile, 2012:03). According to Mtapuri and Sebashe (2010:135), performance bonuses have to be offered to deserving employees in order to boost their morale.

On the other hand, South Africa adopted the incentive policy framework in 2003 which was followed by the employee Performance Management and Development System (PMDS). The policy was aimed at ensuring that pay progression of equivalent value to a 1% notch increment in the public service is integrated into employee performance in compliance with the Public Service Regulations 2001. This policy influences the employer (government) to reward employees who perform satisfactorily in the public service. This act of the employer result in a change of salary notch and the granting of cash bonuses to employees who perform above norm by management (Department of Public Service and Administration, 2003:6). Performance can be recognised by awarding performance bonuses to more deserving employees (Erasmus et al, 2005:290). A performance bonus is a financial award granted to an employee in recognition of sustained performance that is significantly above expectations and is rated as such in terms of the rating scale. In order to qualify for the granting of a bonus, an employee must complete a continuous period of at least twelve months on her/his salary level on 31 March of a year (DPSA, 2007:26).

Robinson (2006:131) contends that money is a powerful motivator that generates satisfaction about the work that has been performed by employees. Monetary reward is helpful in retaining employees against leaving from one employer to the next (Mathis & Jackson, 2003:84). However, O'Faircheallaigh, Wanna and Weller (1999:153) maintain that performance appraisal is linked to classification decisions and salary increments instead of individual performance pay for the most junior staff. In this regard, public sector institutions should offer sufficient monetary reward to their employees. If not, they should at least offer equivalent financial rewards to employees on the same levels who have received higher ratings due to their overall performance in various departments as another way of establishing skills retention programs and avoiding skills loss that may one way or another affect service delivery. In addition, performance pay may tend to create an unpleasant situation for deserving employees who are not recognised for their good performance (Hughes, 2012:247).

2.9.2 Non-financial reward

Non-financial rewards refer to those items that are not pay or benefits but still have a role to play in recruiting, retaining and motivating employees and generating loyalty and commitment (Martin & Whiting, 2013:171). In addition, non-financial rewards refer to non-monetary rewards such as enjoyment of the work performed or a pleasant working environment (Mondy & Noe,

1996:8). The types of non-financial rewards for good performance include but is not limited to increased autonomy, consideration and recognition of performance and recognition of specific achievements (Erasmus et al, 2005:290). These types of non-financial rewards are helpful in improving the quality of work life (Werther & Davis, 1996:416). Non-financial rewards involve recognition of an employees' personal achievements and the granting of increased freedom by management to organise one's own work, a step which also can be made known to all employees (Erasmus et al, 2005:290). Nel et al (2004:64) state that managers can recognise employees by creating an atmosphere where they can participate in all decision-making processes, making resources available to perform tasks, showing respect and giving credibility to one's opinion and also having faith in subordinates.

Similarly, Wilton (2011:237) agrees that non-financial rewards deal with employee needs in relation to achievement, recognition, responsibility, influence and personal growth. In essence, institutions should have non-financial rewards at their disposal in order to motivate employees for their performance in the workplace. They should also have to be recognised in order to create a positive work culture in the institution. The term "non-financial reward" is used to refer to an extrinsic reward which deals with issues of promotion and praise from the supervisor or manager (Williams, 1998:184). Examples of non-financial rewards include trophies, plaques, certificates, scrolls and letters of appreciation (Pattanayak, 2001:237). According to Part VII of the Public Service Regulations 2001, a non-pensionable cash award not exceeding twenty per cent of the employee's pensionable annual salary may be given to an employee based on his/her performance unless the Minister decides otherwise. The next section deals with conducting performance appraisal interview.

2.10 CONDUCTING THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL INTERVIEW

An appraisal develops into an appraisal interview which occurs between a supervisor and his/her subordinate. A performance appraisal interview is conducted one-on-one between the employee and his supervisor or manager (Ahmad & Bujang, 2013:4).

2.10.1 What is a performance appraisal interview?

A performance appraisal interview is the interview in which the supervisor and subordinate review the appraisal and make plans to remedy deficiencies and reinforce strengths (Dessler, 2003:261). Similarly, a performance appraisal interview is an important part in the appraisal process which is conducted between the employee and his/her personal supervisor or manager (Ahmad & Bujang, 2013:4). The performance appraisal interview is regarded as the formal part of the appraisal process where the rater and the person being rated sit down to discuss the

performance of the employee (Nalbandian & Klingner, 2003:283). The discussion that emanates from the performance appraisal interview and the employee's appraisal results should aim at providing feedback regarding performance, compensation, job status, disciplinary decisions, training and development (Leap & Crino, 1993:358). The performance appraisal interview is regarded as a period of high tension between manager and the employee which ultimately could result in conflict if handled poorly (Mathis & Jackson, 2003:362). The success of the performance appraisal interview is dependent upon the interactions that supervisors have with their subordinates and the quality of their relationships (Maley, 2009:6). The performance appraisal interview is conducted by line function employees and therefore human resource specialists ensure that public sector managers are trained on how to plan and carry out appraisal interviews (Erasmus et al, 2005:291). The process of performance appraisal is owned by the human resource department rather than the line managers. Performance appraisal is a process that is applied to all human resources. Erasmus et al (2005:109) argue that performance appraisal involves the assessment of the work performance of all employees at all levels. According to Robinson (2006:228) the following skills are required for an effective appraisal interview:

- Active listening
- Motivating
- Providing constructive feedback
- Seeking agreement
- Persuasion
- Receiving and giving constructive criticism
- Negotiation
- Giving praise and recognition
- Formulating objectives
- Ranking or assessing performance
- Identifying and agreeing on training and development needs

The next section deals with types of performance appraisal interview.

2.10.2 Types of performance appraisal interview

Supervisors conduct a formal appraisal interview at the end of an employee's appraisal period (Mondy & Noe, 1979:345). Public sector managers are expected to conduct the appraisal interviews (Van der Westhuizen et al, 2011:291). There are various types of performance appraisal interviews used in various institutions. They are discussed below.

2.10.2.1 Tell and sell

Tell and sell represents a manager with his/her dual responsibility of being a judge and a jury at the same time who always expect subordinates to behave ethically (Erasmus et al, 2005:291). The role of the appraiser as a judge is to pass the outcome of the appraisal (Torrington et al, 2009: 396). The effectiveness of the tell and sell method is determined by the employee's perception of fairness of the manager's judgement (CCH Editorial Staff, 1988:404). The tell and sell approach has been used by interviewers who have good relations with the management concerned and constantly try to appease the working environment by way of subjecting the assessment to a fair process (Anderson, 1993:102). Supervisors are required to possess a particular skill that goes beyond instilling discipline in an employee. They also have to utilise the available incentives that motivate employees in order to be fully developed (Nankervis, Compton and McCarthy 1992:407). The tell and sell method regards employee participation less important (CCH Editorial Staff, 1988:404). According to CCH Editorial Staff (1988:404) the tell and sell method consists of three stages:

- the appraiser informs the employee of his/her performance
- the employee is expected to accept the evaluation
- the employee does not divert from the performance plan for improved job performance

2.10.2.2 Tell and listen

The tell and listen approach can be compared to the identification and the raising of any shortcoming or positive potential of employees' performance (Daley, 1992:103). Both communication and proper listening skills are required from a supervisor in the tell and listen approach which helps in identifying the strong and weak points of an employee's job performance (Nankervis et al, 1992:407). Communication is a management skill required to motivate people, to instruct, counsel and advise, to build effective teams, to negotiate fairly and to develop staff potential (Kanyane & Mabelane, 2009:65). This approach consolidates the remarks that has to do with appraisal evaluation and the grievance procedure (Daley, 1992:103). In addition, the supervisor is regarded as a judge who hands down the sentence and as such employees are expected to accept the verdict. In contrast, when the supervisor discharges the role of a judge or God is only applicable in the private sector and therefore the public sector is not comfortable with that practice, as it has a detrimental effect on subordinates' careers (Nigro & Nigro, 1976:199). According to CCH Editorial Staff (1988:405) the tell and listen method has three phases:

- the appraisal results are made known to individual employees

- employees are encouraged to express their views
- views are considered to come to a conclusion and a plan for future improvement is determined

2.10.2.3 Problem-solving

The problem-solving approach deals with the manager's role as helper and facilitator vested with the responsibility to resolve problems emanating from performance interviews (Erasmus et al, 2005:291). This approach is employed in counselling rather than in performance appraisal and the emphasis is more on the work situation instead of the individual employee (CCH Editorial Staff, 1988:406). The problem-solving approach is the most appreciative kind of interview since it deals with employee development and it requires supervisors to listen attentively when employees express grievances (Daley, 1992:103). The problem-solving approach does not concentrate on the right or wrong of past performance. It is problem-centred in the sense that it ensures that necessary steps are taken to improve performance in the future (Anderson, 1993:102). Nankervis et al (1992:407) state that the main objective of the problem-solving approach is to stimulate growth and development of the employees. Therefore, problems are discussed as and when they arise, particularly when employees experience some job dissatisfaction which also could hamper employee development.

2.10.2.4 Performance is satisfactory – employee is promotable

The performance of an employee should be satisfactory to such an extent that he/she feels that he/she should get a promotion (Dessler, 2003:262). Moreover, Erasmus et al (2005:280) state that the reviews may be verbal if the employee performance is satisfactory. Kirkpatrick (2006:54) states that when performance is satisfactory it consistently meets the required standard of the job. In this regard, a supervisor has to discuss the employee's career plans and the developmental needs that could assist an employee to move to the next job.

2.10.2.5 Satisfactory – not promotable

Employees' performance may be found to be satisfactory but promotion is not guaranteed. This happens where a company does not have any position to offer (Dessler, 2003:262). Satisfactory performance is managed by the awarding of a performance bonus, pay progression or non-financial rewards (Van der Westhuizen et al, 2011:288). However, employees may choose not to be moved from where they are as they enjoy what they are currently doing and that makes them happy.

2.10.2.6 Unsatisfactory – correctable

An action plan accompanies unsatisfactory but correctable performance as the prime objective of the interview (Dessler, 2003:262). Although corrective measures may be applied to deal with unsatisfactory performance, the employee may be dismissed from his/her duty or even discharged should improvement not be effected (Erasmus et al, 2005:290). Managing unsatisfactory performance requires public sector managers to provide opportunities for training and development to poor performers which aim to improve performance (Erasmus et al, 2005:290). According to Manyaka and Sebola (2012:303) managers avoid poor performance by assigning the work to employees who they believe can do the work properly or choose to do it themselves. In fact, managing unsatisfactory performance is insufficient if corrective measures are not put in place for re-training, counselling/coaching or mentoring, setting clear performance standards and designing a personal development plan (PDP). Lockett (1992:67) maintains that continuous development is the process by which people develop new skills and learn new things. This process depends on the relationship between the institution, the manager and the individual. Should the employee's performance not improve, even after the employee has undergone thorough developmental support programmes; he/she has to be discharged from duty (DPSA, 2001:8).

A performance appraisal interview is the prominent feature of performance appraisal systems (Erasmus et al, 2005:290). Accordingly, a performance appraisal interview is a formal meeting between an employee and a supervisor with the objective to discuss the employee's job performance (Daley, 1992:97). Managers should assess the employee's strengths and weaknesses through career development emanating from the performance appraisal interview (Nel et al, 2004:462). In this instance, a performance appraisal interview is an open process through which managers can obtain information on both institutional and individual performance. The performance appraisal interview should be conducted because it enables managers to provide performance-related feedback with the primary objective of enhancing employee development and improving individual performance (Grobler et al, 2006:290). According to Bendix (2007:303) performance appraisal enhances communication between management and employees which further leads to job enrichment and satisfaction. Therefore, performance appraisal interviews are regarded as performance improvement discussions which deal with all the weaknesses and strengths of employees that are supposed to be mitigated by public sector managers. They also have to come up with solutions in terms of how encountered problems could be resolved to achieve efficiency and effectiveness of the performance appraisal. In this regard, a performance appraisal interview takes place between a manager

and an employee and it is a meeting that is designed to evaluate the employee and create a career development plan.

2.10.3 Steps of the performance appraisal interview

There are different steps of the performance appraisal interview that are conducted in various institutions. Such steps are discussed below.

2.10.3.1 Prepare for the interview

A performance appraisal interview requires thorough preparation, setting of time and date for interviews by supervisors, who in turn will collect information and review all performance records (Grobler et al, 2006:292). Preparation for the interviews commences with introducing employees to the institutional policies and objectives, setting the date, venue and informing employees about the nature of the interview (CCH Group, 1988:402). The gathering of job-related information is done through job analysis techniques (Erasmus et al, 2005:277). Preparation for the interview can best be explained if appraisal forms are made available and the suitable appraisal techniques are chosen (Erasmus et al, 2005:277). Middlemist et al (1983:318) suggest that sufficient time for interview preparation is only two hours, which will help supervisors not to undermine important employee responses. In contrast, Nankervis et al (1992:405) are of the view that preparation for the interviews should take at least ten days to two weeks. Preparation for the interview by the appraiser determines the effectiveness of such an interview by determining objectives to be accomplished (Kirkpatrick, 2006:56). When doing preparations for the interview, the appraiser should brief the appraisee as to what interview is to be conducted and also has to ensure that the appraisal form is completed beforehand (Torrington et al, 2009:397) Kirkpatrick (2006:56) identifies five major objectives to be accomplished:

- to reach agreement on employee performance
- to identify strengths
- to identify performance areas
- to agree on a performance improvement plan
- to agree on what is expected from employees in the next appraisal period

2.10.3.2 State the purpose for the interview

The supervisor has to clarify what the interview is all about for employees to know what to expect (Grobler et al, 2006:292). They have to know if it will deal with issues of compensation and staffing decisions, or employee development. According to Torrington et al (2009:397), both

the appraiser and the appraisee should mutually agree on the purpose of the appraisal interview. For instance, the interview should be about the known responsibilities that employees perform on a daily basis in order to avoid reporting of grievances in the future. In this regard, the supervisor should tell the employees what the performance appraisal interview will accomplish.

2.10.3.3 Indicate specific areas of good performance

The performance appraisal interview commences by commending an employee on his/her positive, performance while areas of improvement are discussed later because appreciation and recognition are fundamental in an appraisal interview (Grobler et al, 2006:292). Appraisal is important to improve current performance by providing feedback on the employee's strengths and weaknesses. According to Martin and Whiting (2003:140) areas of improvement are the developmental needs required to give positive feedback. In support of this view, (Novit, 1979:151) asserts that performance feedback from both supervisors and subordinates helps to identify problems and make the necessary provision for corrective measures. Therefore, the performance appraisal should be linked to a performance improvement process to identify training needs and the potential of individual employees. Thus, development depends primarily on areas that need to be improved.

2.10.3.4 Invite participation

In a performance appraisal interview, supervisors encourage and invite employees to participate by commenting to the proceedings of the interview. This will ease the knowledge gap concerning performance and they also have to mention if there are any performance related problems (Grobler et al, 2006:292). According to Middlemist et al (1983:318) the involvement of employees in the performance appraisal process can help to develop the performance standards on which they should be measured. The process of employee involvement and participation should influence employees to engage in decision-making processes (Robinson, 2006:257). Therefore, if employers and employees jointly meet to discuss issues that promote the employment relationships, a collective agreement is more likely to be reached. A lack of participation by employees amount to inadequate feedback (CCH Editorial Staff, 1988:114). Without feedback from both management and employee, performance appraisal will be dysfunctional (Bendix, 2007:303).

2.10.3.5 Focus on development

Employees are exposed to institutional development programmes through the performance appraisal interview to improve their job skills and abilities (Grobler et al, 2006:292). Therefore, supervisors are expected to demonstrate how development promotes career goals. In developing performance, the supervisors need to know what it is they need to appraise, how to appraise it, who is to appraise who, how often the appraisal should take place and how the results would be linked to improving, developing and rewarding performance (Erasmus et al, 2005:276). In this regard, development should focus on the future and the improvement of individual performance.

2.11 SUMMARY

This chapter has reviewed a wide range of elements in which performance appraisal is embedded and which covers the theory that underpin performance appraisal. It also dealt with what performance appraisal entails, the objectives of performance appraisal, the linkage of training and development to performance appraisal, the regulatory frameworks governing performance appraisal in the South African context, problems related to the failure of performance appraisal, the frequency of performance appraisal, rewarding good performance and the conducting of a performance appraisal interview. It was argued that performance appraisal serves two major purposes in an institution, namely evaluation and employee development. Employee development requires managers to improve employee performance in the future. Consequently, it is the manager's responsibility to encourage employee performance and help them to grow and develop. Encouraging good performance is beneficial to an institution and its employees. The approach to managing employee performance relies heavily on appraisals supplemented with appraisal-related pay. It has been established that public sector institutions are expected to provide training and development to employees in order to achieve an improved job performance, failure of which may create inaccurate appraisals that in essence generates conflict between managers and their subordinates. Hence, there are some problems and pitfalls such as personal preferences and biases that do not only influence the evaluation and appraisal process but also affects the employees' current position and their career growth. A performance appraisal is subject to many errors, including halo and horn effect, central tendency and leniency. The performance appraisal system varies in terms of standards applied in public service departments. Moreover, a performance appraisal interview should be undertaken to discuss the successes, problems and weaknesses encountered throughout the year and to apply problem-solving mechanisms to overcome these obstacles. More importantly, a performance appraisal interview has to be prepared well in advance by outlining the venue,

place and purpose of the interview to avoid any confusion that may arise. Therefore, the employee's performance has to be managed effectively by identifying the employee's areas that need to be developed. Thus, management of employees' performance is indispensable for achieving the strategic objectives of the institution and has to be prioritised to pave the way for institutional sustainability. The research design and methodology relevant for this study will be covered in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter discussed the theoretical framework and literature review of the study. This chapter describes and explains the philosophical perspective, the research design and methodology relevant to the study. This is followed by an extensive discussion on data quality criteria, research ethics and limitations of the study. Furthermore, the chapter identifies the target group, sampling method and the sampling size for this study. In particular, the data collection techniques and analysis utilised for exploring the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisal are presented, described and explained. The next section discusses the philosophical perspective of the research study.

3.2 PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVE

The philosophical perspective of a research study gives direction to the way the researcher formulates the research problem and questions which in terms of a qualitative study can best be explained with due consideration of its interpretivist nature (Creswell, 2013:18). Moreover, the philosophical perspective of a research study is based on a constructivist paradigm which advocates that truth is a determining factor in a research which in essence bring researchers and their participants into close proximity to one another (Baxter & Jack, 2008:545). Therefore, researchers should not divert from what was promised prior to undertaking a research so that participants would not have reason to question its anticipated authenticity and to further give a detailed account pertaining to what is being investigated. This helps the researcher to understand the problem in its entirety. Furthermore, the information obtained from individual participants should also not be misrepresented but reported as was provided from data collection processes.

3.2.1 Interpretivism

Interpretivism in qualitative research was advocated by Immanuel Kant in 1781 Critique of pure reason who believed that there are different ways of knowing the world rather than to do a direct observation (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003:8). Kant proposed that human perceptions cannot be used to interpret our senses. Ponterotto (2005:129) states that the principle of interpretivism is that a researcher cannot separate the reality of the research participants who are the first line of enquiry, about the reality they are encountering daily. Again, knowledge is inseparable from what which human beings understand about the social world and its experiences. Therefore, a distinction has to be made between scientific and practical reasoning, which requires moral

freedom and decision-making that enables social researchers to explore and understand the social world better.

The philosophical perspective of this study is interpretivism, which is the approach to quality data analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994:64). Henning (2004:16) argues that an interpretivist framework underlies a qualitative approach. Interpretivist research is concerned hugely with the question of the trustworthiness of the data analysis (Loseke, 2013:80). In other words, a researcher has to interpret the results of the study as reflected during data collection process and not exaggerate them, because failure to represent the data correctly is equivalent to dishonesty. Denzin and Lincoln (2003:5) hold the same view that qualitative research is an interpretive mechanism which seeks to gain insight into the subject matter, thereby visualising the social world and how it is experienced. The interpretive mechanisms always want to make sense of the researcher's findings by way of setting criteria on how the social world can be evaluated and interpreted. This perspective is commonly known as social constructivism (Zongozzi, 2015:17). Annellis (1996:383) maintains that interpretivism is one of the four basic inquiry paradigms in social science research. Positivism, post-positivism and critical theory put more emphasis on the nature of reality that stays within human minds in search for the truth. According to Tripodi (1988:211), interpretivism is derived from the phenomenological approach and it deals with the behaviour pattern and attitudes of persons in a systematic way in order to ensure the correct interpretation of events in a society.

Interpretivism connotes that the human mind is capable of establishing reality through deep investigation in an effort to reveal that which cannot be accessed by the majority of people (Ponterotto, 2005:129). Moreover, Ponterotto (2005:129) states that in order to achieve this, centrality should always be practised between the investigator and those being investigated. In essence, there should be an effective researcher-participant dialogue and good partnership cooperation between the two groups, otherwise the selected participants may end up withholding information that the researcher should obtain to conclude the research findings. In this regard, the researcher constructs theory to fulfil the research objectives of the study.

Qualitative research is interpretivist in nature as is concerned with how the social world is interpreted, understood, experienced or produced (Wessels & Paul, 1999:390). Thus, interpretivism involves the interpretation of elements of the study and integrates human interest into a study. Moreover, the researcher tends to understand the problem under investigation from the perspective of the participants. Interpretivist studies usually focus on meaning and may employ multiple methods in order to reflect different aspects of the issue. According to Van As and Van Schalkwyk (2000:15), in interpretive research a researcher builds an extensive

collection of detailed records concerning the context, people, actions and the perceptions of participants as the basis for inductive generation of exploratory theory. Interpretivism is mostly used in the human sciences (Mouton, 1996:47). The next section discusses the research design of the study.

3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

Welman and Kruger (2001:7) identified two types of research designs, namely qualitative and quantitative research designs. The main concern of quantitative method is laboratory studies, whereas the qualitative method focuses on people and other information sources such as files. Welman, Kruger and Mitchell (2005:8) state that the purpose of quantitative data is to evaluate objective data consisting of numbers to process data. This research adopts a qualitative research design. According to Leedy and Ormrod (2005:134), qualitative research design can help the researcher to reveal the nature of certain situations, settings, processes, relationships, systems or people; enable the researcher to gain new insights about a particular phenomenon and to develop new concepts or theoretical perspectives about that; discover the problems that exist within the phenomenon; and allow a researcher to test the validity of certain assumptions, claims, theories or generalisations in the real world.

Moreover, a qualitative research design is conducted in the real world as opposed to being experimental depending on the generated data. Paile (2012:44) maintains that qualitative research design seeks to understand both human and social interaction from the perspectives of insiders and participants' interaction. Research design implies that research is conducted according to a pre-formulated research plan. In this sense, the researcher regards research design as the development of the research plan. Planning means a particular interest in solving a problem area and a translation of a specific researchable problem (Van As & Van Schalkwyk, 2000:41). Mouton (2001:55) argues that a research design is a plan or blueprint of how one intends conducting the research.

Mouton (2001:55) further warns researchers not to confuse "research design" and "research methodology" as they are two different aspects of a research project. According to Mouton, a design is theoretical as it has to do with thinking to do something (research) whereas methodology is the how of doing that something and the research deals with the actual doing of a particular thing. Thus, the success of something being implemented starts with the overall thinking about it, followed by the how of doing it. In addition, the aim of a research design is to plan and structure a given research project in order that the eventual validity of the research finding is maximised (Mouton & Marais, 1992:10).

According to Mouton (1996:107) a research design enables the researcher to anticipate what the appropriate research decisions should be, so as to maximise the validity of the eventual results. The chosen qualitative research design for this research project is a case study design, which is essential to explore the manager-subordinate disagreement or conflict in relation to performance appraisal. According to Jensen and Rodgers (2001:236) case study is a form of research conducted within a single agency or political jurisdiction. Case study research has a purposive sampling nature and can easily adapt to an environment where data is collected with the prime objective of representing various groups of people (Tripodi, 1988:216). Welman and Kruger (2001:184) state that the research procedure for case study is participant observation and unstructured and semi-structured interviews. Bailey (1992:47) argue that a case study is an appropriate means of dealing with many research questions in public administration and therefore produces scientific results. As a further extension of this argument, Miller and Yang (2008:99) maintain that qualitative case studies are helpful to acquire knowledge unavailable from surveys. According to Hofstee (2006:123) a case study is used to examine a single case, whereas Welman, Kruger and Mitchell (2005:193) are of the opinion that a case study investigates a limited number of units of analysis. Accordingly, the advantage of using a case study is that it helps to understand the uniqueness of a particular case. Here the researcher studies a case that does help to understand a problem under investigation. A case study research involves the close examination of people, topics, issues or programmes (De Marrais & Lapan, 2004:217).

The major disadvantage reported against case study research is that it provides an inadequate basis for scientific generalisation due to a limited number of subjects involved into it (Zainal, 2007:5). In this regard, case study cannot contribute to scientific development. According to Meredith (1998:444) case study research is subjected to unfamiliarity of its procedures by the majority of researchers and is exposed to construct error, poor validation and questionable generalisability. The next section deals with the research methodology of this research study.

3.4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Mouton (2001:55) maintains that methods are tools that a researcher employs in order to complete a certain task. Therefore, a qualitative research methodology is followed in this study, which does not only enable the researcher to get to know people personally but also to understand their problems in their real life situations. According to Ritchie and Lewis (2003:3) qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that makes the world visible. Qualitative methodology refers to those research strategies such as participant observation, in-depth interviewing, and

participation in that which is being investigated in order to obtain data that no one else has collected (Tripodi, 1988:213). This method is involved with information storage and is not inseparable from history where records are to be kept for future use (Mouton, 2001:107). In other words, all information has to be recorded regarding the number of people being interviewed in order to gain scientific knowledge and first and foremost to record the date upon which the interview is scheduled. Qualitative methods deal with the study of human beings and their behaviour (Thani, 2009:35). Basically, the researcher gathers and collects data to understand a situation from the perspective of the participants, who are the first line of enquiry regarding the problems that they encounter on a daily basis. The advantage of utilising the qualitative research methodology is that it takes place in a natural setting. For this study the natural setting is the Department of Home Affairs in the Tshwane area. Qualitative methodology is also associated with postmodernism, critical theory and feminist theory (Van Schalkwyk & Marietjie, 2000:43). Equally important, qualitative research is theory-sensitive and tends not to test hypotheses. Additionally, qualitative research methodology is not structured and standardised in comparison to quantitative research methodology, but has to be systematically and rigorously conducted (Wessels & Pauw, 1999:391). In essence, qualitative research is concerned with subjective data produced by minds of human beings through interviews (Welman et al, 2005:8). It describes events and persons without the use of numerical data unlike quantitative research methodology. Qualitative research is described by Wessels, Pauw and Thani (2014:161) as the research that aims at the production of non-numerical descriptive data. In this regard, qualitative research is based on explorative methods and is expressed in terms of words rather than numbers. Careful consideration of the various qualitative research methods applied for the purpose of this study are discussed below.

3.4.1 Research methods

Research methods refer to the methods a researcher uses to obtain the data that is to be analysed (Welman et al, 2005:115). According to Mouton and Marais (1992:23), research methods or techniques are supposed to be used to produce valid research findings. The following sections focus on data collection technique which consists of interviews, observation and document study.

3.4.1.1 Data collection technique

Data collection refers mainly to observation, interviewing, testing, selecting and analysing texts (Mouton, 2001:105). Data collection involves applying the measuring instrument to the sample or cases selected for the investigation (Mouton, 1996:67). Hofstee (2006:57) concurs by stating

that data collection means measuring something, setting up an experiment, interviewing people, doing archival research, looking into company records or any one of a host of other ways of collecting primary data. Methods of gathering data for this study consist of a literature study of relevant books and articles on the performance appraisal process, interviews, observations and document study. Two kinds of data are hereby distinguished, namely primary data and secondary data. Primary data refers to the data that no one else has analysed or interpreted whereas secondary data refers to the data that pertains to what is being investigated and has been analysed or interpreted by someone else (Hofstee, 2006:51). Consequently, researchers obtain and experience first-hand information through the collection of primary data whereas a literature review is done through the collection of secondary data which includes, but not limited to, reading of academic books found in the library and elsewhere. According to Miller, Birch, Mauthner and Jessop (2012:33) data collection commences immediately after ethics approval has been obtained, population samples accessed and informed about the study in question and informed consent has been obtained. It is of paramount importance to note that no adequate primary data on the topic were obtained at this stage. Data is collected by making use of the qualitative methods or instrument in this study. The data collection methods and techniques employed are discussed below.

3.4.1.1.1 Interviews

According to De Marrais and Lapan (2004:229), interviews are one of the richest sources of data in a case study and usually the most important type of data can be collected in this way. Mouton (2001:105) describes interviews as structured self-administered questionnaires, semi-structured focus group interviewing and structured telephone interviewing or free attitude interviewing methods. Semi-structured interviews are utilised in this study. Dawson (2002:28) maintains that the choice of semi-structured interviews is to make a concise comparison of information gathered in various interviews where the same questions were asked in each interview. Furthermore, Munzhedzi and Phago (2014:1087) argue that semi-structured questions are compatible with exploratory studies, case studies or studies based on qualitative analysis of data. The researcher prepared an interview schedule of which pilot studies were completed before engaging the sampled population, in order to test whether respondents would understand the questions properly. The researcher prepared an interview schedule with a compiled list of questions to which participants had to respond. Again, additional notes were captured during interviews without distracting the interviewees in the process. All participants granted permission to tape record all interviews when a request was made before the interview conversation could commence. The researcher afforded respondents sufficient time to ask

questions for clarity in relation to the questions asked.

The researcher interviewed participants who are employees (both managers/supervisors and their subordinates) of the Department of Home Affairs in Tshwane, in the Akasia Regional office, Pretoria Regional office (Byron Place), Ga-Rankuwa (Odi) District Office, Mamelodi Medium Office and Soshanguve North Medium Office. The participants were from salary levels six to ten, and consisted of front office clerks, administration clerks, chief administration clerks, senior administration officers, immigration officers, control immigration officers, assistant directors and deputy directors. The interviews were conducted at DHA offices where participants are based, in order to avoid unnecessary inconvenience for the participants. The researcher interviewed not less than three participants a day during official working hours, in a quiet place where there were no disruptions during the conversation took place. Since the participants start working at half past seven in the morning (07:30), the researcher requested to interview them between eight o'clock (08:00) and four o'clock (16:00) even though the close of business is five o'clock. This was to ensure that the researcher and participants were not inconvenienced prior to reporting for duty and off duty. Moreover, participants were kindly requested to switch off their cellular phones before interviews started to have their undivided attention.

MacNabb (2013:111) argues that interviewing is the primary data gathering method that is conducted by researchers pursuing a qualitative research study. The researcher's task as the interviewer is to ask the questions and then write down the responses. In other words, semi-structured interviews are considered to be consistent with this study. Semi-structured interviews are referred to as an interview guide that allows for researchers to compile a list of questions about a specific topic (Bryman, 2001:315). In semi-structured interviewing the order of the questions may change depending on the interviewer's perception of issues that requires urgent attention (Robson, 2002:270).

Although interviews are time-consuming, face-to-face interviews allow interviewers the opportunity to do follow-ups on responses made by participants instead of using posted and self-administered questionnaires (Robinson, 2006:273). Equally important, Tlowana (2009:45) explains that the advantage of face-to-face interviews is that they have the highest response rate and that interviewers can do thorough observations through the use of non-verbal communication. Furthermore, interviews provide an opportunity for a detailed investigation of people's personal perspectives and in-depth understanding of the personal context (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003:36).

Tashakkari and Teddlie (2003:305) urge researchers to be always neutral and non-judgemental

concerning the responses provided by participants. If the researcher is negative and judgemental, this may negatively affect the whole interview process. In other words, the main reason for conducting interviews as a form of data collection is to gain knowledge of how the performance appraisal process is managed. This is because employees are appraised on a quarterly basis before those who qualify for performance bonus are paid accordingly. Welman (2005:166) maintains that unstructured interviews are also employed in qualitative research. On the other hand, semi-structured interviews are considered when the interviews are to be conducted by experienced and expert interviewers (Welman, 2005:167). Thus, the researcher ensured that there were at least two audio recorders, a notebook, a quiet venue with comfortable seating, spare batteries for the recorder and a signed consent form. Despite the fact that interviewing is an appropriate research instrument, there are divergent sources of error and bias involved (Patel, 2013:100). The advantage of using interviews as data collection technique is that more data could be collected, but however, the very same data that has been collected, could easily be influenced by the researcher which is the main shortcoming of interviews in any research study (MacNabb, 2013:294).

3.4.1.1.2 Observation

Observation is a fundamental and important method in qualitative research (Marshall & Ross, 2006:99). Observations referred to in this study includes, but are not limited, to observation of individual behaviour, social interactions and all observable characteristics of participants such as frowning, shaking and scratching of heads. Observations are useful to understand the interactions of individual participants (De Marrais & Lapan, 2004:229). The main reason for undertaking observation is to capture a deeper understanding of the nature of the problems that underlie the performance appraisal process and the reactions of participants after questions have been asked during giving interviews. Individual behaviour was observed, classified and recorded to determine whether or not it matched what the participants had just said. Although the observation technique could fail to provide insights into what the person may be thinking, its advantage is that of comparing actual recorded behaviour with statements made and the validity of responses (Van As & Van Schalkwyk, 2000:87).

The major advantage of observation is that views, feelings or attitude of participants cannot be asked as they can be seen during the researcher's interactions with them, which makes the observation straight forward (Robson, 2002:310). Henning (2004:73) emphasises that a researcher has to make notes of all the contextual factors that participants cannot express such as gestures, facial expressions, tone of voice, change in tempo of speech and general body language. In this regard, personal observations (direct or indirect) also form the basis of this

study. Babbie (1989:81) argues that the researcher has to ensure that his/her observations are careful, deliberate and scientific.

To ensure accurate observations, the researcher recorded all information obtained through observing participants' behaviour. McNabb (2013:111) maintains that the researcher should watch and record the social behaviour of participants and interpret his/her observations. The researcher achieves this by observing the behaviour of individual participants, because failure to observe such behaviour may lead to incorrect and inaccurate conclusions and findings. The most common shortcoming of observation is the failure of the researchers to inform participants that they are observed and that their behaviour is recorded (Robson, 2002:311).

3.4.1.1.3 Document study

Doing a document study enable researchers to supplement the information collected. Document study has the advantage of not interfering or disturbing the case setting in any way (McNabb, 2013:324). The researcher conducted the study by perusing and analysing the government records or departmental documents such as annual performance plans, departmental annual reports, and minutes of moderating committee, memoranda, monthly and annual reports, legislative frameworks on performance appraisal, academic and scholarly books, unpublished theses and dissertations in order to arrive at the findings of how the performance appraisal process is managed. These documents were accessed through the application for ethical clearance that was subsequently granted to conduct this study in the selected regions of the Department of Home Affairs. Confidential information was treated strictly as confidential in order to abide by the rules and regulations of the Department of Home Affairs. The reason for choosing a document study is to gain more knowledge and insight about the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements that occurs commonly in the workplace.

3.4.2 Sampling

The study employs the purposive sampling approach which Welman, Kruger and Mitchell (2005:69) describe as the most important type of non-probability sampling. Purposive sampling offers participants the opportunity of being selected, with the chances of being selected between zero and hundred per cent (Smith, 1981:275). Smith (1991:146) states that purposive sampling removes all the biases that may occur during data collection processes. According to Sanders and Pinhey (1983:120), a researcher has the discretion of selecting participants in purposive sampling that will help to achieve the purpose of the study. There should be a clear reason for selecting a specific type of sampling (Creswell, 1998:118). Purposive sampling means that members of a sample are chosen with a purpose to represent a location by covering all subject

matter and all key criteria (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003:79). In this regard, purposive sampling was considered suitable because the researcher was able to deliberately choose individual participants based on whether or not they were able to provide relevant data about the research topic.

Purposive sampling allows researchers to depend more heavily on their experience and the previous research findings to obtain relevant participants who represent the remaining population which does not form part of the study (Huysamen, 1994:44). The advantage of the purposive sampling strategy is to obtain a unit of analysis or sample that represents the relevant population. The disadvantage of the purposive sampling strategy is that it is impossible to evaluate the samples and therefore there are lots of human biases that play a role in this procedure (Patel, 2013:172). According to Silverman (2005:129) purposive sampling requires researchers to apply their minds when they view the population being studied critically. Researchers who utilise purposive sampling make their own judgement in the selection of sample members (Babbie, 1995:227).

The study is carried out on a sample of twenty-five employees (operational staff members, managers and supervisors) drawn from the Akasia Regional office, Pretoria Regional office (Byron Place), Mamelodi Medium office, Ga-Rankuwa (Odi) district office and Soshanguve North Medium office alternatively. The reason for this is because the researcher wanted to have rich data and to avoid sampling a smaller population of which the number may decline to an extent that accurate results may not be obtained. Out of this twenty-five of the target population interviewed, fifteen were operational staff members or subordinates, five were managers and five supervisors, which adds up to a combination of ten managers-supervisors' from the identified civic and immigration management services (IMS) directorates, since not every employee was interviewed for the purpose of this research study.

The reason for sampling five managers and five supervisors is that each office has one office manager and some have one supervisor or more, since this case study is limited to five DHA offices of Tshwane area. One manager and one supervisor were interviewed per regional office and represent all supervisors in offices with more than one supervisor. Again, three operational staff members or employees were interviewed per regional office as well.

It should also be noted that the Akasia Regional office has of forty-seven employees, one on salary level twelve (manager) regarded as deputy director, five on salary level eight and two on salary level seven (who are all supervisors), thirty-five on salary level six, three employees on salary level three, and lastly, one employee on salary level five. The Ga-Rankuwa district office

has a total of nineteen officials, thus one assistant director on salary level ten (manager), one senior or control immigration officer on salary level eight, one senior administration officer on salary level eight and one chief administration clerk on salary level seven (supervisors), three immigration officials on salary level six, twelve front office clerks (FOCs) on salary level six. The Soshanguve North Medium office has a total of twenty-two officials, namely one manager on salary level ten, one supervisor on salary level eight and fifteen officials on salary level six. The Mamelodi office has a total of eighteen officials, namely one office manager on salary level ten, three supervisors (one on salary level eight and two on salary level seven) and fifteen officials on salary level six. The Pretoria Regional office known as Byron place has a total of one hundred and twenty-two employees, namely one manager (deputy director) on salary level twelve, one assistant director on salary level ten, fifteen supervisors (three control immigration officers and eight senior administration officers on salary level eight) and four chief administration clerks on salary level seven. The targeted employees were only those who have been in the employ of DHA Tshwane area between 2011 and 2016, in order to meet the timeframe of this study. Therefore, the total population was 228, which means that a sample of twenty-five employees constituted only 10% of the total population. The sampled population was interviewed during official working hours, because if interviews were to have been conducted after working hours, during holidays or weekends, a lower response rate could have been the result.

Since a research problem serves as the core of a research project, it is fundamental to note that in order to have such a problem resolved, the researcher should engage a sample population to gain knowledge and insight into the problem under investigation. According to Sekaran (2003:265), population refers to the entire group of people, events or things of interest that the researcher wishes to investigate. The researcher shares the view with Welman et al (2005:55), who believe that it is uncommon to involve all members of the population in a research project, largely because the population may be so many that the researcher cannot accommodate all of them. Additionally, Welman et al (2005:52) state that the population is the study object that consists of individuals, groups, organisations, human products and events or conditions to which they are exposed. For the purpose of this study the population consisted of employees at the DHA in Tshwane area who were expected to offer first-hand information, which could bring forth acceptable results pertinent to the problem.

The population involved in this study included, but was not limited to top management, middle management and operational workers of the DHA from HR, Civic Services, Immigration Services (IMS) and Counter Corruption divisions.

3.4.3 Data analysis and interpretation

Babooa (2008:152) argues that the first step in the analysis of data is critical examination of collected data. Data analysis includes both quantitative and qualitative analysis which consist of thematical and content analysis (Mouton, 1996:67). The researcher has to search for data to obtain evidence that leads to him/her to make a final decision by keeping the research questions in mind during the interview process (De Marrais & Lapan, 2004:232). According to Hofstee (2006:117), data has to be analysed to turn it into evidence. Also, Hofstee (2006:117) identifies two types of data analysis, which are statistical analysis techniques and textual analysis. As a matter of fact, statistical data analysis can best be applied in quantitative research whereas textual analysis is more compatible with qualitative research. Mouton (2001:108) describes the aim of analysis as to “understand various constitutive elements of one’s data through an inspection of the relationships between concepts, constructs or variables and to see whether there are any patterns or trends that can be identified or isolated or to establish themes in the data”.

All the audiotaped interviews were transcribed for further examination through the help of a professional transcriber. This process was followed by open coding of themes related to the purpose of the study. Robson (1993:477) emphasises that codes are related research questions, concepts and themes. Codes are helpful in combining all aspects of similar features for them to operate effectively. In fact, themes emerging from the transcriptions were grouped together in order to create the main categories and subcategories of themes. The minor categories of themes were ultimately grouped together under the overarching or main categories. Data emanating from transcriptions was compared and collated with data emanating from observation. In essence, data was analysed by using or applying inductive content analysis in order to obtain valid research findings. The next section deals with the data quality criteria.

3.4.4 Data quality criteria

The data quality is clearly explained in terms of the model suggested by Guba and Lincoln (1994). The data promote the element of trustworthiness and therefore a data quality criteria for qualitative research is subdivided into transferability, credibility, dependability, conformability and authenticity.

3.4.4.1 Transferability

Transferability refers to the extent to which the results of qualitative research can be generalised by describing the process adopted for other researchers to understand (Welman et al,

2005:145). Transferability ensures that a research study has a common ground that does not undermine the social world (Bryman, 2001:272). In this regard, research should not stand in isolation but should capture the interest of the readers and build on the previous studies to maintain the general standard of a scientific research for the simple reason that no one else questions the validity of its results. In addition, the researcher should ensure that the findings of the study are transferable between the researcher him/herself and those being researched (Van As, & Van Schalkwyk, 2000:67). Therefore, the findings of this research study are comprehensive enough as to be applied to similar contexts.

3.4.4.2 Credibility

Silverman (2005:377) define credibility as the extent to which any research claim has been shown to be based on evidence. The responsibility of the researcher is to ensure that the credibility of this qualitative research relies on the results obtained. The participants of the research study are expected to be agreed to this. Kumar (2014:219) postulates that credibility involves establishing that the results of qualitative research are credible or believable from the perspective of the participant in the research. Credibility creates opportunities for research findings to be accepted by other researchers as the most important destination of research study (Bryman, 2001:272). Credibility is judged by the trustworthiness of the research (Robson, 2002:109). In this regard, the researcher has compiled the findings of the study in such a way that there would be no doubt in readers' minds that the findings of this research are believable.

3.4.4.3 Dependability

The dependability of the study can be expressed in terms of its reality of being repeated (Van der Riet & Durrheim, 2006:53). The researcher ensured dependability by clearly describing and explaining the research design, methodology, data collection processes, data analysis process and sampling strategy which could make it easier for the study to be replicated. Dependability requires that the same results that are obtained could be used to observe the same thing twice in order to improve the dependability of the study (Kumar, 2014:219). The findings of this research are not dubious, meaning that they can be replicated at various intervals in the future by researchers if similar processes and procedures were to be followed and applied.

3.4.4.4 Conformability

Conformability helps in establishing the value of the data and therefore the researcher frequently assures the participants that the qualitative research could be confirmed by others. Conformability is associated with reliability in quantitative research (Kumar, 2014:219).

Confirmability is achieved through the use of an audit report wherein the researcher establishes the value of the data collected (Van As & Van Schalkwyk, 2000:67). Therefore, the value of the data collected is dependent upon the strength of the research and the close proximity and accessibility of the participants to the research. In this regard, the researcher did not attempt to influence the participants or the final findings of the study. As a matter of fact, the researcher remained neutral as an observer.

3.4.4.5 Authenticity

The results of this study are genuine, reliable and trustworthy. In fact the researcher has engaged in educative authenticity because the study indicated that the views of the participants were respected and valued. Guba and Lincoln (1994:105) state that the quality of the research can be judged in terms of its trustworthiness and authenticity. According to Bryman (2001:274), the authenticity of a research should be guided by its fairness, ontological authenticity, educative authenticity, catalytic authenticity and tactical authenticity. Therefore, fairness means that research should reach out to all members in the social world and seek to eliminate possible imbalances that might be there. In the context of this study, authenticity was achieved by:

- ontological authenticity, which means that members should understand social issues equally
- educative authenticity which carries with it an element of appreciation towards individual viewpoints
- catalytic authenticity which is derived from the common effort directed towards achieving the common goals
- tactical authenticity which shows that research empowers members are to meet together for action

The next section focuses on ethical compliance when undertaking research.

3.5 RESEARCH ETHICS

According to Welman et al (2005:181), the research ethics is concerned with issues of honesty and respect for the rights of individuals. Brynard and Hanekom (2006:4) state that a researcher should report the truth in all circumstances that should never be presented in a biased manner. According to Welman et al (2005:181) ethical consideration is concerned with plagiarism and honesty in the reporting of the results. The feasibility of the research is judged against its ethical objections (Welman et al, 2005:276). Ethics refers to rules of conduct, conformity to a code or set of principles (Robson, 1993:65).

This research was enhanced by the ethical considerations, which required the researcher to get approval from the Department of Public Administration at the institution or University upon which the research or Master's study was registered (in this case Unisa) where the researcher is a student. He was given permission to go ahead with the process of interviewing a sample of population. Permission was also requested and obtained by the researcher in question from the DHA for the latter to peruse all the necessary documentation in order to obtain valid data. The researcher submitted a written application to the Department of Public Administration and Management at Unisa for ethical clearance in order to conduct the semi-structured or in-depths interview within the selected DHA Tshwane regional offices. The Unisa's Research Ethics Committee considered the researcher's request letter, approved it and ethical clearance was then granted. The researcher drafted another letter and attached it to the Research Ethics Committee's approved letter, addressed to the senior management of the DHA to utilise selected DHA Tshwane offices for data collection purposes. The reason for seeking such a permission to utilise the premises where these participants work, is to gain entry to such premises and to avoid any violation of participants' rights. The researcher therefore also took the issues of privacy into consideration.

Permission to conduct the research study was also obtained in writing from the Director-General of the Department of Home Affairs. According to Robson (2002:70) ethical consideration is the responsibility of the approving committee whose agreement leads to the commencement of the data collection. In essence, the researcher guaranteed the right of privacy of individual participants, thereby ensuring anonymity.

The reason for complying with the research ethics is to ensure that the research adhered to the university's ethical guidelines throughout the entire study, in order to protect research participants from victimisation and exploitation, which could lead to the violation of personal rights. The researcher assured and guaranteed the respondents that he would adhere to ethical principles during the course of the research project.

Hofstee (2006:119) warns researchers from deviating from the procedures for which approval was granted. In such instances where deviations are noted, it is essential for researchers to have new ethical procedures approved. Failure to comply with this may render the approval null and void. All the participants in this research study were consulted about their involvement in the research which was voluntary. They were also informed about, the date and venue where the interviews were to be conducted

3.5.1 Confidentiality

Confidentiality arises from respect for the right to privacy (Punch, 2014:47). The question of anonymity forms the basis of the interview that employees choose to participate in. According to Babbie (1995:451) researchers should remove names and addresses of respondents in the questionnaires and replace them with identification numbers. In fact, confidentiality refers to the situation in which the researcher agrees to keep the respondent's information confidential. Sanders and Pinhey (1983:398) contend that participants agree to participate in a research project when confidentiality is guaranteed by researchers. In other words, the biographical details of all respondents remain confidential and are not disclosed to anyone by any means. The researcher guaranteed the respondent's confidentiality by assuring them that identifying information cannot be made available to anyone who is not directly involved in the study. Mouton (2001:244) states that confidential information provided by research participants must be treated as such by researchers.

3.5.2 Right of privacy

Privacy refers to individuals' right to control the disclosure of what they deem personal or non-public information about themselves (Punch, 2014:47). According to the author, the right to privacy is associated with people's right to be free from any form of research intervention that causes them to be uncomfortable to provide any information they regard as sensitive. Smith (1991:604) highlights that researchers should make provision for some protection of individual privacy. The author further states that the invasion of privacy may commence from the choice of topic to publication and beyond.

Huysamen (1994:183) recommends that researchers should refrain from discussing personal information of participants in public because that is the invasion of privacy. Furthermore, if participants are observed and such observations are recorded without their knowledge, it is a serious invasion of an individual's privacy. In this regard, the right to privacy is associated with the right to control what is known about one's personal life. The participants were consistently assured by the researcher that they would not be subjected to any victimisation, and the researcher ensured them that their right to privacy was protected as well. They were also informed that their identity would remain anonymous and that they are highly respected. The respondents were not compelled to participate in the study but they were required to sign a consent form prior to taking part in the interviews.

3.5.3 Informed consent

The researcher should not force anyone to participate in a research in order to receive an approval (Huysamen, 1994:179). Van As and Van Schalkwyk (2000:179) maintain that there must be voluntary participation which can be achieved when participants are fully informed about the procedures and risks involved in research for them to give their consent to participate. Henning et al (2004:73) state that respondents need to firstly give consent to participate by being informed about the interview purpose. The researcher ensured that participants were not involved into the study without their knowledge. Therefore, the researcher familiarised himself with the University's ethical guidelines which require an approval letter before he could go ahead with the research. In this regard, the ethical clearance letter was accompanied by a consent letter that gives the researcher permission to utilise all DHA premises for the purposes of this study as stated above. It was expected of DHA employees to give their consent in writing to participate in this study as well. This was to clarify that participation in the study was not compulsory, but a matter of choice and that participants were to take part freely based on informed consent.

The respondents were also informed about all the necessary procedures involved in research which includes stating clearly the institution the researcher represents, telling them what the researcher wishes to do and asking for written permission to proceed. They were also assured that they may withdraw from participating at any given time. According to Sanders and Pinhey (1983:396) the researcher should provide the sample consent form to each participant, indicating the purpose of the study and why they were selected to participate. The completed sample consent form is included in this study and each participant is expected to append a signature as a symbol that he/she has agreed to take part in the study. Ritchie and Lewis (2003:66) highlight that informed consent is associated with providing information to participants about the purpose of the study, the funder, who the research team is, how the data will be used, what participation will require of them and how much time is required.

3.5.4 Right not to be harmed

The researcher abides by the ethical standards and ensures that no violations are made regarding participants. The study should not harm an institution and therefore all the responses are to be used for the purposes of this investigation only and not any other purpose whatsoever. Welman et al (2001:182) maintain that a "researcher should not embark on research involving the use of skills in which they have not been adequately trained; to do so may risk causing harm to subjects; abusing subject's goodwill and damaging the reputation of the research

organization". The respondents were not subjected to any physical and emotional harm. To avoid this, participants should be encouraged to report any awkward behaviour and any unpopular attitudes from the researcher (Babbie, 1995:449). This research study does not demonstrate prospects of causing harm to the people being studied. In this instance, participants were constantly advised not to reveal any information that will embarrass them later or endanger their reputation. Ritchie and Lewis (2003:69) encourage researchers conducting interviews to consistently be on the look-out for any signs of discomfort from participants, as this may deter them from continuing with the interview. Moreover, it is essential to note that there might be a risk that involves the researcher him/herself that needs to be avoided and it is advisable for researchers to conduct risk assessment well in advance by obtaining background information about participants to be interviewed in any fieldwork.

3.5.5 Anonymity

The researcher ensures that participants' right to anonymity is given priority by ensuring that they remain anonymous and that no identities, names or contact information is provided and disclosed to any third party to avoid tracing of responses by particular participants (Babbie, 1995:450). In other words, anonymity means not divulging the identity of participants to people outside the research team. Equally important, Mouton (2001:243) maintains that informants have a right to remain anonymous. According to Hofstee (2006:211), anonymity deals with promises researchers make to protect the identity of participants that should be adhered to throughout the interview process. Welman et al (2005:196) argue that the mediator should be used in order to gain access to both participants and the researcher. Therefore, the question of anonymity forms one of the bases of the interview of this study of which employees chose to be part. The next section reflects on the limitations of this study.

3.6 LIMITATIONS

The current research was only concerned with exploring manager-subordinate conflict of performance appraisal process from the selected DHA offices only, namely the Akasia Regional office, Pretoria Regional office (Byron Place), Ga-Rankuwa (Odi) District office, Mamelodi Medium office and Soshanguve North Medium office in the Tshwane Area. In fact, a limitation to this study is that it relied on information obtained from a small number of employees (small sample). In this regard, participants included in this study were operational staff members, supervisors and managers. These participants were from salary levels six to ten. Operational staff members are on salary level six, whereas supervisors are those employees who are referred to as senior administration officers and control immigration officers who are on salary

level eight and chief administration clerks who are on salary level seven. Office managers are referred to as assistant directors, who are on salary level nine and deputy directors are on salary level ten. Since the sample was small, the findings of this research cannot be generalised to other regions of the Department of Home Affairs. Nevertheless, the findings of this study could be applicable to other settings. Furthermore, qualitative data collection techniques such as interviews and observations were used for data collection. A quantitative survey may be undertaken in order to overcome the limitation of qualitative data collection instruments. This could help in improving a sample, thereby reaching out to a larger number of respondents.

3.7 SUMMARY

This chapter described and explained the research design and methodology, data collection instruments, population and sampling procedure, followed by the research ethics of the study. Qualitative methodology was regarded as the most appropriate for this study because it is concerned with how people interpret their experiences and the social world and attach meaning to it. The research instruments (interviews and observation) which were used to collect primary data from the staff of the Department of Home Affairs in the Tshwane area were identified and described extensively. The study identified five DHA regional offices in Tshwane and the number of the sampled population from whom relevant research data was collected. Moreover, the chapter provided the case study research design which for the purpose of this study is relevant to achieve valid research findings. The chapter provided and discussed elements of qualitative research methods. In addition, data quality criteria, data analysis and interpretation were also discussed. The next chapter presents the discussion and findings relating to manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements during performance appraisal processes.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter described and explained the philosophical perspective, the research design and methodology relevant to the study, followed by an extensive discussion on data quality criteria, research ethics and limitations of the study. Furthermore, the chapter identified the target group, sampling method and the sampling size for this study. As indicated in the first chapter, the purpose of this study is to explore the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisal in the Department of Home Affairs in the Tshwane area. Moreover, this chapter explores the sources of conflict or disagreement between managers and subordinates in relation to performance appraisal and explains the extent to which manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements influence performance appraisal processes within the Department of Home Affairs in the Tshwane Area. An understanding of sources of conflict between managers and their subordinates pertaining to performance appraisal is essential in order to identify strategies that could help to defuse such challenges. In this sense, possible influences of such conflicts on the performance appraisal process could be minimised.

4.2 SOURCES OF CONFLICT BETWEEN MANAGERS AND SUBORDINATES

This section presents the opinions of research participants regarding the sources of conflicts or disagreements between managers and subordinates in relation to performance appraisal and their responses were aligned in terms of the following subthemes:

4.2.1 Inconsistent measurement of performance

Public sector institutions are vested with the responsibility of arranging their basic requirements in line with each performance measurement instrument (Erasmus et al, 2011:285). Similarly, the performance measuring instrument should provide personal details such as the period in which the review is undertaken, surname, job title, comments by senior public sector manager, actual performance appraisal, scoring, and provision for training and development for it to be consistent. Therefore, in relation to the issue of consistency of the performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs, participants demonstrated that consistency can be perceived when there are no reported changes in terms of ratings. In this regard, some participants commented as follows:

“It can’t be consistent if it changes now and then because if you check, a person can get what we call the performance bonus or the incentives ... like okay take it, today they give you maybe

so much ... it is not stable if others may get it this year but next year they won't get it. These kind of ratings are not being consistent because they change now and then because of the work which we are doing in the Department. We are doing the same work at the same position why next year you won't get it, you are supposed to get it because you are doing the same job at the same time at the same level. There are supposed to be changes, it is not consistent and stable". With left hand on left cheek (Operational staff member 1).

"According to my knowledge about this performance appraisal process, it is not consistent, based on the fact that when you assess employees, say for instance you assess 14 employees. At the end of the day the performance appraisal moderation committee will come back and say to you there is no money. That's where the challenges are, as supervisors will tell you the money must cater for all the offices, actually not only one office. That's our challenge and that is why I say it is not consistent" Pointing with right finger (Supervisor 1).

"The challenge that we are having as immigration officers is that the people who went to draft the key result areas (KRAs); most of them never worked on the ground like operational, so those KRAs that they have implemented are not practically achievable in the sense that most of the things that we are supposed to achieve; some of them are not in line with our daily duties as immigration officers. Therefore the performance appraisal process is not consistently in line with our daily duties". Scratching head which shows being unsure (Operational staff member 6).

"It is not consistent due to the challenges that we face. Some of the key performance areas are not applicable when is time to evaluate the performances because they are not mentioned on the KRAs but are still some of the duties that you perform daily that are not recognised on the performance appraisal". (Operational staff member 7).

"Actually my view on this performance appraisal or PMDS is that it is consistent if in the office maybe we work at one thing. In my office we work at different things. I can be in Birth, Death and Marriage (BMD) today and I can be in smart card tomorrow. I will be a cashier the next day so when it comes to measuring my performance, how is that going to be done because they only focus on one thing which is the BMD that is where I am appointed ... but if I do everything else and then by the end of the quarter or whatever, I am only assessed on the BMD. How fair is that? For me it is not, but then I don't only ... work in BMD section, I work as a cashier, I work in smart card systems, but then my performance can only be measured in one area which is BMD, so for me it is not. I don't do one thing but then at the end of the day I am only measured for one which is BMD whereas throughout the quarter or term I have been working in different

sections ... that is what I am saying ... I don't think it is stable enough for me"(Operational staff member 18).

"It does not actually measure what we are doing on a daily basis, it does not have the actual targets that will make you reach the level where they say you have done your best. It shows each and every key result area (KRA) as something that we are doing on a daily basis, meaning for you to reach the bonus level you need to show them the whole box of what you are doing almost every day ... it is difficult because they consider each and everything that is on the KRAs as what we are doing. So for you to say you have got a bonus is something else, so it is not doing what it is supposed to be doing" Looking confident (Supervisor 2).

The majority of the participants are of the view that performance measurement can be inconsistent if it changes regularly and therefore, it becomes a source of conflict between managers and subordinates. This happens when employees perform tasks that are not listed on the key result areas (KRA) which managers and supervisors do not recognise when appraising employees' performance. Since the key result areas reflect the key actions and activities that aim at ensuring an effective performance, these key result areas should be included in the work plan of a particular employee (Erasmus et al, 2011:282). Similarly, this view was supported by the findings of Radebe (2015) which revealed that managers believed that the performance appraisal process was not effectively implemented, due to the absence of a mutual setting of performance criteria and objectives. Moreover, it is important that both managers and supervisors should apply a uniform standard during the performance appraisal process, with the right measurement tool.

4.2.2 Inaccurate performance measurement instrument

The management of performance starts with the development of the performance measuring instrument (Erasmus et al, 2005:285). Besides enhancing employee performance, the performance measurement instrument is useful in the evaluation of training programmes (Radebe, 2015:176). Therefore, there are numerous problems with regard to performance appraisals which render the performance appraisal instrument inaccurate. These problems include a limited discussion on performance appraisal and all the other techniques that compose the entire performance appraisal process (Daley, 1992:57). Managers with positive attitudes should ensure that performance ratings are accurate and have to provide support to employees (Du Plessis, 2015:76). In this regard, the accuracy of the performance appraisal is determined by whether its practices accurately reflect an employee's job performance (Harrington & Lee, 2015:219). Performance appraisal is characterised by dissatisfaction on the

part of both the employer and employees and as a result, most employees view it as inaccurate, unfair and political (Shrivastava & Purang, 2011:632). An inaccurate performance appraisal instrument is more likely to assess a performance dimension incorrectly (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2014:354). The participants raised multiple concerns regarding the inaccuracy of the performance appraisal instrument. In fact, the participants indicated that they are not able to establish a link between their performance and monetary rewards due to the poor performance rating instrument. Some of the participants expressed their frustrations as follows:

“I wouldn’t say it is well, because for me I do not know what is expected of me. I know my duties. I do them and I do more than my duties sometimes, but still I would get a three, so sometimes I do not know because ... I know that in our Department we deal with statistics. We need to meet targets ... so I can’t say I have reached the stats and argue that I get a better level because I do not know where I stand in terms of being measured” With eyes wide open (Operational staff member 4).

“It is not accurate, because automatically it is the one standard performance agreement but you find that because you were doing more than what is on your contract and then denied a bonus. Immediately when you are denied a bonus they change your contract to fill all those duties that you were doing that are not on contract, so that with the final assessment you do, they will say ‘But these are all your duties that you are supposed to do’ ... ” Looking around (Operational staff member 8).

Smiling before giving response. “For me the instrument they are using is not doing well for me, because I feel like it is restricting me, sometimes I do the extra mile and it is not recognised. I feel like my performance is not recognised” (Operational staff member 9).

“It is not accurate, simply because the employees also do not keep the statistics. There are cases where statistics can easily be kept because if for example you are an adjudicator, the adjudication is done on the computer. It is online, so it will be easy to retrieve it, because it comes from Visa Facilitation Services (VFS) from VFS, then it is assigned to an adjudicator and then once the adjudicator is done with it, then you will have the information in the system. That makes it easier and also accurate because it comes from VFS. It goes to the adjudicator and then when the adjudicator has finished adjudication, then they will dispatch the outcome to the client. Statistics remain on the system, but what in my view brings the inaccuracies, is because sometimes they have to review the decision of the adjudicator. Sometimes you know the outcome. If it is a rejection there will be an appeal that comes from it, but theoretically it is supposed to be easy to retrieve the information” Folding arms. (Manager 3).

“The performance of an employee is not well rated in most instances, because of what I indicated initially. In most instances you will find that there is agreement between the supervisor and a subordinate and it goes very well, but when it goes to the level where somebody has to append the signature upon receiving the motivation of whatever is laid down by the person who works with the people, it gets a denial simply because ... the employer tends to focus on the outcome, but when it comes to the issue of appraisals or remuneration on any other thing, he doesn't care about that. He becomes a bit difficult so it is not well measured” (Manager 4).

The majority of the research participants are of the view that there are inaccuracies embedded in the performance appraisal instrument because even if employees go the extra mile, they still do not get performance bonuses but are rated average. Essentially, there should be an ideal performance appraisal which is described as the type of appraisal that is accurate and seeks to improve an employee's job performance and making administrative decisions (Kondrasuk, 2012:116). Therefore being too harsh or too lenient to employees may negatively affect the accuracy of the performance appraisal process.

4.2.3 Invalid performance appraisal instrument

The participants indicated that the performance appraisal instrument used by the Department of Home Affairs does not measure their actual day to day performance. This implies that the instrument could be regarded as being invalid. Basically, validity refers to the accuracy of the ratings; if a performance appraisal instrument is valid, the best performers should be rewarded, opposed to under-performers who are not rewarded. In other words, the validity of the appraisal system depends on its job-relatedness and whether or not it reflects a person's true performance (Fleenor & Scontrino, 1982:20). Managers should refrain from using different standards and expectations for employees performing similar jobs (Radebe, 2015:177). This may compromise the validity of the performance measurement instrument and ensue in unnecessary confrontations. In essence, a valid performance appraisal instrument should reflect ratings that represent true scores that are always stable and subjected to development (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2014:357). Therefore, the use of uniform criteria should have to be emphasised in order for employees to achieve the optimum performance. The performance appraisal instruments are mostly related to concerns about their reliability and validity as the main requirements of a measuring instrument. Validity is improved when more items are contained in the rating instrument, delegation of tasks to members take place that should assist with observations and having observations done on various intervals (Erasmus et al, 2011:273). The findings of this study indicate that conflict between managers and subordinates emerges as a result of a perception of an invalid and unreliable performance measurement instrument.

This sentiment was articulated by participants as follows:

“In government since we work and rotate at times, it does not measure exactly what we are doing, because we are being rotated as opposed to the position that you are hired for. Say you are hired as a clerk and after that you are moved to work in another section, so based on that, they have to rotate the instrument to fit the roles and responsibilities assigned to employees”. Scratching head which symbolises being unsure (Operational staff member 2).

“The things that you are doing in the office are not reflected on the key performance areas What I am doing does not reflect on the performance appraisal instrument although it is part of the job that you are doing but you are not recognised for that” (Supervisor 2).

“Sometimes this performance appraisal does not only look at my roles and responsibilities, because there are times when I need to act beyond my roles and responsibilities, but which are not part of this appraisal instrument or performance. It doesn’t include that in most cases you will be taking the responsibilities of the senior management, but in terms of performance appraisals those roles and responsibilities that you took which are in line with the supervisory level, ... are not taken into consideration. Sometimes it can be a demotivating factor in terms of the performance of an individual, but in line with the position. I think it plays a bigger role” (Operational staff member 7).

Supervisors should refrain from setting or applying controversial performance standards for employees, because this may invalidate the performance appraisal instrument and causing the evaluations to be unreliable (Dargham, sa:6). In essence, a valid performance appraisal instrument is free from any bias in terms of race, colour, sex, religion, nationality and creed (Chen, 2011:55). Equally important, managers and supervisors need to ensure that employees do not feel that they have been dealt with unfairly during the performance appraisal process.

4.2.4 Perception of unfairness

Any form of perception of unfairness in relation to the performance appraisal process creates an aura of animosity between the rater and ratee. The findings of this research indicate that employees of the Department of Home Affairs in Tshwane have less confidence in the performance appraisal process, due to perceptions of unfairness associated with this process. Most of the participants expressed concerns about favouritism which is noticeable during performance appraisals. Unfairness in terms of rating an employee’s performance is a pitfall to the effective management of performance appraisal, as alluded to by some participants:

“Supervisors or managers turn to favour some colleagues, in some cases you will find that those

who work hard get less marks for their performance” (Operational staff member 2).

“I don’t think they trust us as supervisors to assess them fairly and objectively because they believe they are doing more than the way we assess them. When we assess them we follow the way the instrument has been designed and you find that is not reflecting what they are doing, so they believe that it is not fair because they are doing more but they are given less (in terms of scores)” (Supervisor 2).

“Supervisors are biased in the sense that favouritisms also affect a lot. When they favour you, no matter how you do, they will just say that you are okay. If you are not favoured that makes the whole judgemental process to be wrong, because of when they judge, they judge on their feelings. They don’t look at your abilities and your strengths and what you can do. ... the favouritism within the office influences them. If somebody likes them favour you, whatever you do just goes. When they don’t favour you, no matter how much you work, the attitude and favouritism makes everything to be not fair” (Operational staff member 10).

“They are biased because you work as a team, like a team of two people. You are doing the same thing most of the days, but you will find that the supervisor favours one. So whilst the job you are doing is the same every day, ... there’s bias in the appraisal process, even though you will try to have proof, saying ‘I did this and this so and did so this and this’. We did the same thing, same time, same day, but still they will favour one party” (Operational staff member 11).

As a result of the above responses, it is clear that employees are not content with the manner in which performance appraisals are conducted within the Department of Home Affairs. This could be one among a multitude of reasons why performance appraisals fail in some of the institutions. The more employees perceive their performance appraisal system as fair, the more they reported higher levels of trust and satisfaction with the appraisal system (Harrington & Lee, 2015:214). As a consequence of favouritisms during the performance appraisal process, employees who perform above average are not recognised and this leads to the development of negative perceptions about the entire process. A performance appraisal process should be unbiased, reflect fair judgement about how employees have performed and how they should be treated (Long & Kowang, 2013:888). Thus, an institution should depend upon the positive employee perceptions of performance appraisal fairness.

The processes and procedures linked to performance appraisal should be fairly established in order to ensure that employees are comfortable when intending to express themselves (Sumelius, Bjorkman, Ehrnrooth, Makela & Smale, 2014:572). When ratees do not perceive fairness and trust in the performance appraisal process, they deny the accuracy of the system

and will feel that they are given inaccurate information regarding the performance criteria (Kondrasuk, 2012:120). Therefore, an employee's perception of unfairness is described in terms of the perception of distributive justice and the perceived fairness of the appraisal rating in relation to employee's performance. The perception of unfairness and inequality in the rating lead to the collapse of the whole system (Arogundade, Temitope & Arogundade, 2015:100). Moreover, should the performance appraisal system be perceived as unfair, disputes, mistrust and disrespect will be the order of the day, whereas fairness perception should be measured by using distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice and informational justice (Getnet et al, 2014:184). At the same time, performance appraisal should be concerned with procedural fairness, respect for the individual, mutual respect and transparency of the decision-making processes (Armstrong 2006:6). Additionally, Getnet et al (2014:184) state that a performance appraisal system which is perceived by employees as an unfair process will become a source of disputes, mistrust, disrespect and other social problems within an institution.

4.2.5 Absence of constructive feedback

While there is a need for performance to improve, employees are faced with a major challenge when there is an absence of constructive feedback which is required to re-align performance and to understand their strengths and weaknesses (Cardy & Leonard, 2011:140). Regular feedback should be provided by managers and supervisors throughout the rating period (Pulakos, 2011:7). There are three purposes of performance appraisal:

- to provide employees with feedback
- to control employees with feedback
- to determine individual merit (Getnet et al, 2014:182)

In this regard, managerial responsibility includes, but is not limited to, providing feedback in a constructive manner, whereas employees are responsible to seek feedback to determine where they are in terms of performance. Contrary to what should happen ideally, the findings reveal that employees within the Department of Home Affairs are not provided with constructive feedback pertaining to their performance. Clearly, if employees do not receive any form of feedback on their performance, it would be difficult for them to improve their performance standards. At the same time, if a manager or supervisor raises a concern about performance standards or allocate poor ratings to an employee whose performance is below standards, conflict may erupt due to a lack of proper feedback. If constructive feedback had been given, that may have contributed to improved performance. The following statements capture the

absence of feedback on performance within the Department of Home Affairs:

"They won't come back to you, even after the presentation. They won't come to you and say ... your mistake is this one. We are supposed to get feedback, but there is no feedback that we receive from them. After they present you to the panel, they will just say 'we are done' ... Our supervisors do not know anything, that is why I said there is no feedback and no communication". Rubbing hands (Operational staff member 1).

"No we don't get feedback, they only give feedback to those who perform well; those who they think will get a bonus for performance. If you didn't get enough marks, they do not even bother" (Operational staff member 2).

"I would be lying if I would say I have noticed any (feedback). That's all I can say. I have maybe seen in a paper remarks 'She has achieved', I have never received anything verbally to say 'You are doing good, thank you for doing this, Can you try to do this for another month or another (year). There is nothing that I can say has been specifically directed to me as feedback on my progress'" (Operational staff member 4).

"According to my experience, ever since I started working in this department, I don't remember any day that we got feedback from our supervisor after the appraisals or during it. We never got that. Yes I think it is one of the problems that demoralises us when it comes to this appraisal thing. Yes even if you insist to get it, they will tell you ... you just wait and you will see after the result you don't get the feedback anyway" (Operational staff member 5).

"Usually we don't give feedback because most of the performance is just norms. ... I feel that sometimes it is useless to give feedback on a norm, but in a case where it is a bonus, we give feedback. Maybe they were expecting one, two or three but now we gave less, maybe they were downgraded or maybe they were upgraded, so we do give to the qualifying ones. If they do not qualify we do not give feedback" (Supervisor 2).

"There is a very big challenge on the constructive feedback that we are not receiving from the management, or from the supervisor level, and it also has a negative effect on the officials. (They want) ... to know that they are on the right path or the right track, or they are achieving what is expected from them and they have been appraised well for what they deserve or not"(Operational staff member 7).

"Feedback; I don't receive any feedback. We only do performance (appraisal) and fill in those things. From there there is no feedback. I haven't received any. ... The only thing that you hear is that you should perform this and do that. It is only instructions and advice what should be

done, I haven't heard that, no I don't get at all" (Operational staff member 9).

"Honestly, the feedback that the supervisors will give you during the performance appraisal, especially in Home Affairs, I could simply say that I have never experienced ... that they will give you feedback for your performance. I don't know, maybe others or maybe it is because I know that I am good at what I do" (Operational staff member 10).

"We don't get feedback, no we don't get. You will only see with one person that it means you qualified for one per cent. There is no feedback, you will only see on the salary advice that this person got a percentage; it means this person reached a norm. There's no formal feedback saying we were at the performance appraisal, this was happening, this is how I presented you. There's nothing like that" (Operational staff member 11).

"As I said before, we are not conversant with that. Our superiors don't communicate with us, so we don't even get feedback on the processes. That is why I believe most of the officials around are not even aware of this process. There is no feedback. We are just working as normal, but when told about the performances ... that your performance is not good, what can you do about those things?" (Operational staff member 12).

"No one gives us feedback. They will just tell you that ... we don't get because of the monthly target the office doesn't reach ... so the office doesn't qualify for PMDS, even though people can motivate that they work hard and submit the work that they have done, still they do not qualify" (Operational staff member 13).

"No we don't even get feedback... we also knew that they won't even give you feedback and even from the start they will say ... you know that the office does not reach the target ... even when they come back they won't tell you how the process went or at least the feedback how everything went, so we just go on, yes we don't get ... feedback. They don't give us feedback" (Operational staff member 14).

"Our supervisors do not normally give us feedback. After the rating they give us something to sign, then is done. No they don't even give us feedback from the PMDS moderation committee" (Operational staff member 17).

I have never received one, I have never insisted on getting feedback, I think I have asked once or twice what happened and I think they just said 'politics' and since then I didn't even bother. No the supervisor does not give me feedback that flows from the appraisal committee or the moderation panel" (Operational staff member 19).

Generally, the above findings suggest that employees should receive feedback about their performance in order to know where they stand or whether they should improve their performance, which is exactly what the employer expects from individual employees. Indeed, employees who receive constructive feedback normally accept the feedback with the view that one day they will receive higher ratings (Rolle & Klinger, 2012:305).

4.2.6 Situational factors

The research findings show that various situational factors such as leadership style, stress and sexual orientation may negatively influence the performance appraisal process ensuing in conflict between managers and subordinates. Some of the participants hold the view that women tend to be favoured during performance appraisals due to their gender.

“Yes, if I say leadership styles, there are people who are just leaders. Maybe they are charismatic leaders or they are leaders because other people like them. You end up giving performance bonuses to your friends. If you are the sexiest and like women you will not consider men but end up giving performance bonuses to ladies” Looking down (Operational staff member 1).

“Your question does not differ that much from number four ... yes they do. If a manager is a female ... is biased towards a female colleague and if a manager is a male and favours a female employee ... it can influence the performance appraisal. ... In terms of stress, well it is not easy to judge if someone is under stress. You will never know when performance appraisals are done and when the supervisor or manager is under stress, it is easy to influence the result. (There is) racial bias regarding black and white. Even when whites do not perform, they normally get good marks for their performance. Leadership styles, yes I nearly forget, there some leaders that are programmed, they can't think for themselves, they always take what their manager says and in that way is like they are like bottlenecks” smiling (Operational staff member 2).

Most of the participants held a view that stress and leadership style greatly influence the performance appraisal process. In essence, poor leadership style may also result in bias and conflict. Equally important, poor leadership style may also result in poor ratings and prejudice. Again, a stressed manager may fail to afford a junior employee an opportunity to engage on issues affecting his/her performance. Participants echoed their feelings in this regard as follows:

“Stress can influence the accuracy of the performance appraisal. If I am stressed it is going to affect everything which is around me. How am I going to work under the influence of stress ...? Even if I came to work because I do not want to be absent from work, but then when I get here

I am stressed, each and everything I do is because ...I am stressed and here in the workplace lots of people you can see they are stressed” Rubbing nose (Operational staff member 3).

“The way the official is viewing my leadership style also affects me. If an official thinks that I favour the next person more than him/her, she/he won’t cooperate with me because I cannot say maybe my leadership style is one, two, three, it is what they see in me, so the way they view my leadership style also affects ...” Blinking right eye (Supervisor 2).

“Concerning leadership style it really influences the accuracy of the performance appraisal, because ... I will be with my line manager. The supervisor will agree on the score, ... then we agree. When it goes to the manager he will have an influence and say that this rating cannot be like this. You must change it down; if it was four, it will be three, if it was three it will be two” Closing eyes (Operational staff member 8).

“Yes, stress is influencing the process, like sometimes I feel like if the supervisor is stressed he doesn’t care or maybe when I am stressed I would like the supervisor to give me time to explain my situation and must not use his personal stress... and again leadership style, like if maybe supervisors dictate, maybe if that can change, we can enjoy what we are doing. I have to take instruction, but don’t dictate ... also if you give one person more responsibilities whereas others are relaxing is just stressing...” (Operational staff member 9).

“Yes, stress, racial and sexual bias and leadership style can influence the accuracy of the performance appraisal when you talk about stress-related issues. Of course, when you have stress issue, you won’t perform; your performance as an employee will just deteriorate; it will just drop. Sexual and racial bias are like for instance when there are other areas where they discriminate against you ... you find that maybe in performing your duties there are sections where you are not allowed to work in. With regard to leadership style, if ever there is autocratic leadership style at some point, the employees will be affected and once you have that autocratic leadership style, it is difficult for employees to cooperate” (Operational staff member 10).

“Regarding the leadership style, yes, I think if the manager or the supervisor does not have good relations with the subordinates, it will automatically be a problem in the assessment of employees. Stress and leadership style are hampering the services because ... if you don’t know how you can address your stress problem, you end up not performing” (Operational staff member 12).

“Stress, racial and sexual bias and leadership style can influence the accuracy of the performance appraisal. If a person is stressed, firstly that person cannot work properly because

stress works hand in hand with the mind and the attitude, so that person cannot perform. Leadership style is also affecting the officials, for example if I am a leader and I am biased and treating other officials this way and others that way, it will also affect the official's performance, because if the official is not well, definitely the production will not increase. Previously I was working in the citizenship section, my boss was an Indian and we had white staff and most of the time they would be sitting this way and blacks would sit that way and when it comes to performance appraisal, all the whites get (positive) performance appraisals and as for the blacks: maybe you will find one per cent is getting one bonus or sometimes we don't even get that. We only get one per cent without getting the bonuses, so really it does influence ..." (Supervisor 6).

"I think stress, we have stress from home, financial stress. Whenever I have that kind of a problem, I won't perform to the best. Leadership style does influence the accuracy of the performance appraisal, because sometimes you think that a person is autocratic, he just dictates" (Operational staff member 15).

"I think so that stress, sexual and racial bias can influence the accuracy of the performance appraisal because when you are depressed or stressed you won't be able to concentrate or work in front of clients. You will be angry at clients, so you won't be able to perform well if you are always angry or depressed. I am not sure about sexual and racial bias, but the issue of stress can influence the accuracy of performance appraisal. I think leadership style as well can influence the accuracy of performance appraisal. If the supervisor does not speak the same way to you as she speaks to other officials, maybe she is being harsh. It can also influence the accuracy of the performance appraisal" (Operational staff member 17).

"Yes, you know, stress I can comment on, or if one comes with stress from home it will definitely affect the performance of the individual and that has no good consequences for what we expect from individuals. The stress has to be managed. If we can have something like psychologists in the Department that can assist to give an individual the coping mechanisms and ways to handle the stress or how to avoid the stress, that would be good. We lack the psychologists who can assist" (Supervisor 7).

"Given the historical context of South Africa, where we had as separation between whites and blacks, I am still convinced that those bias in terms of the race still persist even in the so-called new democracy ... if you were to check the statistics of the number of people who normally get performance bonuses; if you look at it in the light of the white-black thing, you will find that the majority of those who get good appraisals are more whites in a situation where there are whites."

There are white people, especially in the Department of Home Affairs. I have seen that they were consistently getting good appraisals and you know there are blacks who have never received a bonus in their lifetime, so I am not even sure that how performance is done is an accurate way ...” Scratching the right ear (Manager 3).

“Leadership style can influence it because as a leader the person must motivate the subordinates so that they can do as expected. If a person is not motivated you cannot expect him to perform very well so I can say sometimes leadership style can influence the accuracy of the performance appraisal. If it is not properly managed it can influence it badly” Leaning on the table (Manager 4).

Situational factors such as stress, sexual and racial bias or leadership style can badly affect the accuracy of the performance appraisal (Erasmus et al, 2005:275). On the other hand, leadership styles can cause performance appraisals to be subjected to some imbalances (Kondrasuk, 2012:119). In addition, leadership style influences the decision-making process because of the actions displayed by the autocratic leader who abuses power and position to dominate everything, instead of encouraging his/her colleagues to take part in the process (Ahmad & Bujang, 2013:5). Work-related stress is a product of the perceptions of procedural unfairness (Getnet et al, 2014:189). Once organisational stress increases, employee performance declines and so does job satisfaction (Mofoluwake & Oluremi, 2013:75). This suggests that should personal bias prevail, the performance appraisal system would be improperly conducted.

4.2.7 Unavailability of funds

Although money can be utilised to pay performance bonuses, employers should also consider non-financial rewards as a solution towards the unavailability of funds, such as anything that enhances a worker's sense of self-respect and esteem by others (Cascio, 1998:388). Ideally, the public sector institutions should plan thoroughly for their activities which also have to be budgeted for (Public Service Regulations, 2001:148). The absence of financial rewards in connection with performance constantly creates tension between managers and their subordinates. In fact, once some of the subordinates notice that the ratings will not yield any form of financial reward, conflict ensues. Managers and their subordinates with the Department of Home Affairs articulated mixed feeling regarding the issue of financial rewards:

“We can finish whatever we have and then we increase what is expected of employees ... knowing very well that in the long run we are not going to give performance appraisals and bonuses to all of them, the reason being that there are no funds available” (Manager 4).

“When coming to performance agreement I will say in my view everybody must qualify for this because we are working really hard, so unfortunately they will say there is no money” (Operational staff member 19).

4.2.8 Unclear performance standards and targets

The research findings indicate that unclear performance standards and targets may contribute to conflict between the manager and subordinate during performance reviews. This could be attributed to the fact that it becomes extremely difficult for subordinates to fully comprehend what is expected of them if performance targets are not clarified. At the same time, it could be difficult for the manager or supervisor to award a fair performance rating. As a result, conflict can easily emerge if these issues are not dealt with at the beginning of a financial year. Regarding the issue of unclear performance standards and targets, supervisors agree that some of the performance targets are unrealistic:

“Most of the time we don’t even meet the requirements, because we don’t meet the target because of some challenges that maybe we could solve before the target was set” (Supervisor 6).

“In most cases targets are a bit unrealistic, mainly because they are top-down and not based on any benchmarking case prior to what you know of. Of late they will be basing these targets based on the previous cycle and you wouldn’t have an understanding why they would have been based on the previous cycle. You won’t get to understand why they are up and not kept constant” (Supervisor 3).

“Performance appraisal does not have the actual targets that will make you reach the level where they say you have done your best as it shows each and every key result area (KRA). It shows something that we are doing on a daily basis, meaning that for you to reach the bonus level, you need to show them the whole box of what you are doing almost every day and that is difficult” (Supervisor 2).

The main reason why there are unclear performance standards and targets is that managers have a limited training on how to conduct a performance appraisal (Belcourt, Bohlander & Snell, 2011:325). Besides, performance standards should be clearly defined by indicating what measures are to be achieved (Radebe, 2015:176). In addition, performance can be managed well when there are set standards that guide employees in terms of how they should perform (Makamu & Mello, 2014:105). In this regard, there is non-payment of performance bonuses to good performing employees, because most of the employees seem not to be aware of their

performance targets.

4.2.9 Scarce resources

The absence of resources required to maximise performance may frustrate employees when they are rated low by managers. Research participants highlight the fact that they cannot be able to perform optimally in some instances due to lack of resources. Some of the views in this regard are captured by the following statements:

“We struggle a lot about the instrument to do the work, but I do whatever it takes to do my work. We don’t have enough equipment to do the work” Shrugging (Operational staff member 16).

“You put your hands together, being few people or short-staffed ... we short everything, we don’t have materials to work here” (Operational staff member 19).

“Sometimes we cannot perform exactly what is expected of us, due to lack of resources of the department, for example we are using old machines like our computers ... we don’t have modernised resources. We only have one printer in our office and you can imagine how big is this office, even our immigration (section) does not have systems to work on ... we lack the resources” (Supervisor 6).

The correct tools are supposed to be provided for the successful completion of tasks and for employees to meet their targets. In fact, these tools include management support, technological tools such as computers, training of employees, adequate human resources or man-power (Manyaka & Sebola, 2012:306). Moreover, there should be an equivalent allocation of adequate resources to undertake the tasks (Erasmus et al, 2005:128). According to Luthuli (2009:467), if resources are scarce, conflict will rise between employees. As part of their responsibilities to manage poor performance, public sector institutions are also obligated to make tools available to employees so that they could meet their targets (Public Service Commission, 2007:15). Over and above this, the performance appraisal process should present managers with an opportunity to give guidance to subordinates, as to how the available resources could be utilised in line with the institutional strategic goals (Farndale & Kelliher, 2013:882).

4.2.10 Appraisal timing and lack of evidence

Performance appraisal should be administered in terms of the work cycle that reflects adequate time for appraisals and also outlining all the job responsibilities for a particular employee (Daley, 1992:27). Furthermore, rating employees according to the date they were hired, allows managers to allow enough time to pass in order to have a productive appraisal (Kondrasuk,

2012:121). Performance appraisal enables managers to have proper time management in terms of how employees should be guided and to have their performance managed appropriately in the workplace (Van der Waldt, 2004:213). Essentially, performance appraisal requires that each line manager should appraise the performance of their staff on an annual, six-monthly or even quarterly basis (Torrington & Hall, 1995:319). Accordingly, public sector managers should consider evaluating employees at regular intervals to determine whether their performance is above what is being expected (Kondrasuk, 2012:116).

Some of the participants indicated that timing of performance appraisal could also be a source of conflict, particularly if such a performance review is scheduled at a time when subordinates are not able to gather sufficient evidence to motivate their performance. One participant expressed the following views:

“Performance appraisal is done in a short space, it is done twice a year ... we don’t have enough time to prepare for statistics. Supervisors will come today and say ‘Please prepare your evidence and your statistics because your performance is to be appraised tomorrow’ ... (Operational staff member 15).

The absence of enough performance evidence creates tension between managers and their subordinates. Managers and subordinates articulate frustrations on this issue as follows:

“The way we are rated and the manner in which they need evidence ... if you perform they say they need evidence, ... and then when you perform they need evidence and you ask yourself ‘what evidence?’, because there is evidence already in my personnel file, but still they need one to provide evidence” (Operational staff member 2).

“At the end of the assessment employees have to get bonuses, the challenge is that some of them, even if they qualify, they lack evidence” (Supervisor 1).

4.2.11 Unbalanced distribution of tasks

Managers should clarify areas of responsibility and work distribution. If an employee is willing to perform a task and stay over after work, it should not be generalised if the rest of the employees are unwilling to perform such a task (American Management Association, nd:17). In this regard, performance appraisal should assist in dealing with the inequality in the distribution of tasks.

“What is expected of them vis-à-vis the activities that are being done every day ... it is not fair for one official to do fifty per cent more than the next official ... you will find that you are rating yourselves with other offices that are doing the same job as yours. You will find office A are not

doing anything most of the time, you in office B, are always busy but you are rated the same, so that at the same time it is the cause of the disagreement” (Supervisor 2).

4.2.12 Unclear performance agreement

Performance agreement should have to be entered into by an employer and an employee who also has to be reviewed annually. A performance agreement should be clear so that individual employees would be able to sign them with ease (Erasmus et al, 2011:280). Of particular importance is that performance agreement outlines the description of the job purpose, identification of key result areas, clear criteria and standards, agreement on a personal development plan, determination of performance-related rewards and dispute resolution mechanisms. To a large extent, an unclear performance agreement deters employees from achieving institutional objectives and therefore renders the performance appraisal process ineffective.

“(If there is) no clear performance agreement, you see immigration services as if we had looked at the drafting of the key performance indicators (KPI’s). They were based on what other regions were doing, which were incorporated and adopted and the situations are never the same, so not clearly defining the performance agreement and also expectations and how those will be executed also poses a challenge” (Supervisor 3).

“It is one standard performance agreement, but you find that because of the fact that you were doing more than what is on your contract and then denied for bonus, immediately ... they change the contract to fill all those duties that you were doing that are not in the contract, so that when the final assessment comes, they will say ‘But these are all your duties that you are supposed to do’ ...” (Operational staff member 8)

Concerning this issue, the Department of Home Affairs should design its performance appraisal process, which reflects clear performance agreements for employees to know exactly what is expected of them.

4.3 THE INFLUENCE OF MANAGER-SUBORDINATE CONFLICTS ON THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS

The previous section outlined the sources of manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisals. In this section, the extent to which manager-subordinate conflicts influence the performance appraisal process is described and explained.

4.3.1 Polarised relations between managers and subordinates

The findings of the research reveal that incessant conflict between managers and their subordinates may result in polarised relationships between parties involved. To a certain extent, there could be a loss of respect between managers and subordinates if such tensions are not managed professionally. Managers and subordinates in the Department of Home Affairs expressed their views in this fashion:

“Conflicts lead to a bad relationship between managers and their subordinates. You will find that the subordinates will not have respect as expected or they are not doing as expected, because of the conflict which affects their performance appraisal” (Operational staff member 7)

“Conflict can affect (relationships), because at the end of the day (me being a junior) I’m going to end up saying ‘You know what I’m no longer going to take it, give me whatever you think you want to give, because now it is becoming an argument. We don’t have to argue, so take your decision about me’. So we end up leaving everything and I am no longer going to do what I am supposed to do. It may result in unnecessary arguments and insults. Shrugging (Operational staff member 5).

“Conflicts can lead to a dispute, maybe lodging of grievances ... mostly it leads to a dispute, but also it demoralises the subordinates. You will find that an official refuses to sign, which delays the process, or they have a dispute and lodge a grievance” Waving hand (Manager 2).

“If I have a conflict with a manager or a supervisor, I don’t think I will be happy about it, as what he told me I won’t do, because we have conflict” (Operational staff member 19).

All parties involved in performance appraisals are expected to have a common understanding of performance expectations, however, that can only be realised when there is an effective communication (Radebe, 2015:176). In particular, employers should have trust in their employees, but also be able to convince the employees to perform effectively. Proper communication system between these two parties is vital (Van Hoek & Schultz, 2014:387). Polarised relations between managers and subordinates negatively affect the performance appraisal process. Therefore, there should be a need for managers to maintain a good relation with subordinates.

4.3.2 Poor morale

Employers should be concerned about the morale of workers because low morale could lead to expensive issues with high turnover rates or low productivity (Van Hoek & Schultz, 2014:386). Employees' morale may be affected due to poor performance ratings, lack of feedback and reward for good performance. Consequently, junior staff members may tend to be less interested in performance reviews, due to conflicts or disagreements with a manager:

“The challenge is that it affects the performance of employees at the lower level, because the more you are not even rewarded or acknowledged, or they don't acknowledge what employees are doing, that is what is going to create conflict between managers and employees and sometimes it demoralises employees ... negative perceptions about performance appraisal process may start to develop” (Operational staff member 6).

“Conflict can affect the performance appraisal in different ways or it can lead to a way in which it can demotivate the employees or the officials in the department. ... the morale of the officials goes down when they expected to have been appraised properly” Shrugging (Operational staff member 7).

The morale of the employees or subordinates may be greatly affected if there are poor relationships between officials and managers in the workplace.

4.3.3 Delays in completion of performance appraisal process

Persistent conflicts between managers and subordinates pertaining to performance appraisal may result in unprecedented delays in terms of capturing employees' performance. This could also result in delayed payment of financial rewards to an employee disputing a performance review score. At the same time, such delays could lead to grievances in relation to the performance appraisal process, defeating the whole purpose of the performance review process. Research participants uttered the following statements:

“I think it is going to delay the whole process because as a subordinate you want to prove your point and it is going to take time” Shaking head as a sign of being unsure (Operational staff member 9).

“The moment there is conflict, performance bonuses are delayed or it can delay even the departmental budget, because they will say that the performance management development system (PMDS) of this year is in the old financial year ... When the financial year ends we are trying to pay employees with the finances of the former years, like if 2016/2017, automatically

we will take the money of the 2016 financial year and utilise it to pay that particular year but the more we are in conflict it will now be extended to the 2017/2018 budget which will lead to an audit query” (Supervisor 5).

“Conflict may lead to grievances and refusal to sign appraisal review documents which can result in unprecedented delays” (Manager 2).

“Conflict creates unnecessary delays; employees will rate themselves negatively/moderately in order to prevent or avoid conflict in relation to the scores” (Operational staff member 9).

4.3.4 Negative attitude towards the performance appraisal process

The research findings indicate that negative attitude toward the performance appraisal process may emerge following a conflict between managers and subordinates. A negative attitude towards performance appraisal could be due to the perception that it is unfair and could therefore determine how employees respond to it. The whole performance review process may become lack-lustre, characterised by anger and feelings of dissatisfaction.

“Yes, they can affect the performance appraisal process, because once conflict arises between the managers and subordinates, one doesn’t respect or recognise one’s performance or strength. Of course it creates a negative attitude among the employees. They will have that negative attitude saying that if I work I or don’t work, still I am not being recognised and that is going to make the performance of the office to go down to lower ... because conflicts need to be resolved. Once they are not resolved they make the office ungovernable” (Operational staff member 10).

“Yes, now if there is a conflict and it is not resolved amicably it will lead to a subordinate not trusting the appraisal system. It is always good that within the subsection you do the appraisal, but to keep track of the work that has been done by the subordinate, you can do it monthly so that the subordinate can also be aware if there is low performance on his/her side. He is aware ... to say ‘By the way in such a month I did not perform well’. If the appraisal time comes after the twelve months period it, mustn’t be a new thing to the subordinate. In that way you will have avoided the conflict between the manager and subordinate.” (Manager 5).

Managers who are responsible for conducting performance appraisals perceive performance appraisal as an uncomfortable and emotional process that causes them to be defensive. They are not sure of what they are doing, they do not know the purpose of performance appraisal, what is it that they should measure and how often should it be measured (Du Plessis 2015). Importantly, performance appraisal process is managed well where employee attitude towards

the system is inseparable from satisfaction with the system (Arogundade et al, 2015:100). According to Thurston and McNall (2010:208), the attitude towards the appraisal system is positive when the performance appraisal procedures are fairly practised. People's attitude and behaviours are driven by the manner in which they perceive reality, and if their performance is being recognised, they will develop a positive attitude and work harder (Miah & Talukder, 2012:95). On the other hand, a negative attitude towards performance appraisal deters employees from accomplishing their tasks with ease (Kanyane & Mabelane, 2009:66). Moreover, in a performance appraisal process, employee attitudes toward the system are strongly linked to satisfaction with the system (Ocheti, Maronga, Muathe, Nyabwanga & Ronoh, 2012:41). In Boswell and Boudreau's (2000) view, perceptions of fairness of the system are an important aspect of the performance appraisal system that promotes positive attitudes and practice that contribute to employee effectiveness (Anderson, 1993:46). For instance, employees should develop a positive attitude as an important characteristic for employee performance.

4.3.5 Lower/moderate ratings

When the performance is understated, the ratee receives lower ratings than what he/she deserves. In this case the rater turns to be very strict when rating the performance of an employee (Radebe, 2015:177). In other words, supervisors tend to rate employees who disagree with them lower, and when this happens, employees become afraid of speaking up, but rather remain silence for fear of being victimised (Garner, 2016:31). The findings of this research are in line with the existing literature on the issue of poor ratings as a consequence of challenging managers and supervisors regarding the allocation of performance scores. The research participants stated that they would rather rate themselves lower to avoid continued conflict, despite the level of their performance. The following comments were uttered:

"You just score yourself as normal just to get it done and get over it ... That's why I say even though you know you performed well, but you will just score yourself normal just to get it done because you don't want to cause conflict with the manager" (Operational staff member 9).

"Conflict can affect the performance appraisal process because when it is time for you to score yourself, you will always score yourself three, because when you score yourself a four, all the evidence that are needed you can't find" (Operational staff member 11).

4.3.6 Absenteeism

Continued conflict regarding performance reviews may result in a situation where employees avoid reporting for duty. Consequently, absenteeism affects the work environment, because it gives effect to wasted salaries and lessens the levels of productivity within an institution (Belcourt et al 2011:91). However, the institution can accommodate absenteeism from work due to sickness, family problems and accidents, rather than chronic problems that are more common in environments where employees are not happy. Research participants revealed that they would rather stay at home than have to confront managers on issues of performance ratings.

“Conflict is one of the reasons that other officials decide not come to work ... they say, ‘I come to work, I work hard, but at the end of the day I get a two. It is also causing us not to come to work’. ... today I am giving myself leave, because in that office you go and work hard, but at the end of the day even the manager cannot see that you are doing something in the office. Then you end up taking sick leave. Then you find that the office is now empty, because three officials are not at work” (Operational staff member 14).

“If the relationship between the official and the supervisor is not good, definitely this will affect the official and the official will not do the work properly ... if the official is not happy with anything, the rate of absenteeism is going to be high ... and then you will ... start seeing the backlog in the office, ... because of the conflict between the supervisor and the official” (Supervisor 6).

“Conflict may also lead to an increased level of absenteeism, particularly if employees can see that they are less recognised when it comes to performance appraisal” (Operational staff member 2).

“Conflict can lead to poor service delivery and absenteeism” Blinking eyes (Operational staff member 15).

Ultimately, the performance review process can be hampered by the absence of certain employees who fail to complete performance reviews on time due to absenteeism. Indeed, such absenteeism could have a negative impact on the overall institutional performance.

4.3.7 Poor cooperation

Employees should be looked after in order for institutions to be able to maintain good partnerships or cooperation and to avoid conflict (Bendix, 2007:305). A problem can arise if supervisors are not co-operative and well-trained in terms of performance appraisal (Makamu

& Mello, 2014:108). Some of the participants revealed that conflict between managers and subordinates may lead to reduced levels of cooperation during the performance review process:

“Conflict leads to poor cooperation between supervisors and subordinates” (Operational staff member 8).

4.3.8 Negative bias and poor ratings by a supervisor

The research findings indicate that managers or supervisors may tend to be negative towards junior staff members who confront them on issues relating to performance scores. Subsequent to a conflict situation, managers may be negatively biased towards a dissenting employee and allocate lower ratings. One of the participants expressed this problem clearly:

“If a supervisor has a grudge against me, he won’t consider me positively. He just writes what he wants, because he hates me, he won’t represent me in a right way” (Operational staff member 1).

Unfortunately, a performance appraisal is regarded as unsupportive and conducted in a biased manner (Sebashe & Mtapuri, 2011:1326). Negative bias involves giving satisfactory or unsatisfactory appraisals to non-qualifying employees due to favouritism and ill-feelings respectively (Kondrasuk, 2012:119). Bias is reflected in many ways, which include the recency effect, the halo effect, central tendency and prejudice (Ahmad & Bujang, 2013:6). It is within the ambit of the law to provide public services impartially, fairly, equitably and without bias (RSA Constitution, 1996). Biased rating is associated with subjective assessments during performance appraisal and it discourages performing employees to be rated the same as underperforming employees (Munzhedzi & Phago, 2014:1094). According to Coetzee and Schreuder (2014:354), the main reason why there is personal bias on the side of appraisers, is because they base the ratings on race, religion, gender, and age, which makes them to rate favoured employees higher, with unfavoured employees receiving lower ratings. It is reported by the above authors that men receive higher scores than women when being rated by men counterparts. This means that male and female supervisors rate subordinates of the same sex more highly than subordinates of the opposite sex. Consequently, if performance appraisal is biased, it means that it caters only for the needs of a certain group of employees and therefore is not effective enough to bring better results.

4.3.9 Lack of trust in the supervisor

Performance appraisal encourages communication and builds trust that sustains the relationship between a supervisor and a subordinate (Pichler, 2012:710). The level of trust that

employees have towards their supervisors, causes the performance appraisal process to be effectively managed (Farndale & Kelliher, 2013:880). Contrary to these assertions, participants note that conflict tends to result in diminished levels of trust between managers and subordinates during the performance review process:

“I don’t think employees trust us as supervisors to assess them fairly and objectively, because they believe they are doing more than the way we assess them, and when we assess them we follow the way the instrument has been designed, and you find that is not reflecting what they are doing. So they believe that it is not fair because they are doing more but they are been given less” (Supervisor 2).

“Performance appraisal has been done grudgingly. You know people don’t have that confidence and they will just say, ‘You know what, you will give me according to the norm because I have done these things’, but where there is evidence, people will then be hoping, but also that is now dependent on the moderation panel” (Supervisor 3).

“The only thing that they don’t trust is the appraisal committee and when one tries to engage the committee to address issues which form part of the dissatisfaction, the committee tends not to address those issues ... when it comes to the committee there is no such trust” (Manager 4).

Trust in a supervisor emanates from a strong relationship that he/she has with subordinates and is defined in terms of the willingness of the employee to act in a manner that incites violence (Byrne, Pitts, Wilson & Steiner, 2012:131). The supervisor’s responsibility is to instil confidence in subordinates, thereby fairly observing an employee’s job performance and to facilitate employee development where underperformance has been noticed.

4.4 SUMMARY

This chapter has presented the various sources of conflict between the managers and subordinates in relation to performance appraisals. In this regard, the research findings indicate that manager-subordinate conflict could be attributed to inconsistent measurement of performance, an inaccurate performance measurement instrument, an invalid performance appraisal instrument and a perception of unfairness. Additionally, sources of conflict between managers could emerge due to lack of constructive feedback regarding performance and unclear performance standards which could create frustrations for employees. Similarly, poor appraisal timing could frustrate employees even more, particularly if the appraisal is scheduled at a time when an employee is not able to obtain all the required evidence to demonstrate performance levels of hard work and commitment.

Furthermore, this chapter has described and explained the extent to which manager-subordinate conflict influences the performance appraisal process. In this respect, the findings show that conflict between managers and their subordinates during a performance review may escalate into polarisations of relations that tend to be difficult to deal with. In fact, tensions could result as a negative attitude could develop towards the performance appraisal process. Moreover, conflict creates unprecedented delays pertaining to the completion of performance reviews within the Department of Home Affairs. If these conflicts are not managed or handled appropriately at an early stage, employees who may have challenged certain ratings by supervisors and managers, are bound to be prejudiced severely. Ultimately, this could result in diminished levels of trust between managers and subordinates, to the detriment of institutional performance.

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter has presented the findings and discussion for manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisal in the Department of Home Affairs in the Tshwane area. In other words, the primary purpose of this research was attained by answering the main research questions. Therefore, this chapter briefly deals with the major findings, conclusion and recommendations of the study within the framework of the identified research problem and stated research objectives which were also outlined in chapter 1. In fact, the chapter deals with the summary of the main findings. The recommendations consider the effective performance appraisal within DHA and seek to suggest a best possible way of managing employee performance.

5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The findings of this study are based on the main research purpose which is as follows: To explore the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to the performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs, Tshwane area. The following research objectives were identified in chapter 1, flowing from the main research purpose:

- To explain the theoretical framework which is relevant for understanding performance appraisal within an institution.
- To describe and explain the research design and methodology applied in exploring the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisal.
- To explore the sources of conflicts or disagreements between the managers and subordinates in relation to performance appraisals.
- To determine how conflicts or disagreements influence the performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs.

5.2.1 Research objective 1: Theoretical framework regarding performance appraisal

The above research objective was dealt with in chapter 2. In that regard, it has emerged from the study that performance appraisal could best be understood by aligning it with the leader-member exchange theory which emphasises consistency as a feature of a successful performance appraisal process. As a subject of chapter 2, the theoretical framework was linked to the literature review of this study. This is where performance appraisal was discussed in depth in order to understand its true meaning. The chapter also reflected on the Regulatory Frameworks governing performance appraisal in the South African Public Sector.

5.2.2 Research objective 2: Research design and methodology for understanding manager-subordinate conflicts

The above research objective was achieved in chapter 3. The study demonstrated that a qualitative research design was appropriate for exploring manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisals. In particular, a qualitative case study research design was found to be more suitable for the purpose of this research.

5.2.3 Research objective 3: Contribution on the sources of conflicts or disagreements between the managers and subordinates in relation to performance appraisals

One of the main findings of this study is that performance bonuses and biased ratings by managers and supervisors are the sources of conflicts or disagreements between managers and subordinates in relation to performance appraisals. In fact, there is a persistent conception or view that there is inconsistent measurement of performance which renders the entire performance appraisal process ineffective and creates the opportunities for conflict between managers, supervisors and their subordinates. Essentially, the purpose of performance appraisal is rather to ensure that its implementation is carried out uniformly and consistently across all public service departments or institutions (Erasmus et al, 2011:284).

The researcher believes that the Department of Home Affairs is obligated to ensure that the performance appraisal is conducted in a manner that is stable and fair to all the stakeholders of the process (i.e. raters and ratees). In essence, stability and fairness can only be exercised by eliminating all the factors that renders it ineffective and inconsistent.

The performance measurement instrument is also considered inaccurate when it has the potential of negatively affecting performance ratings and allocation of scores of individual employees. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance to develop the performance measurement instrument for the benefit of the entire department so that it could yield good results that are acceptable. The researcher concurs with the above statement in the sense that the inaccurate performance measurement instrument reflects invalid information, leading to invalid ratings. Generally, a poorly developed or formulated performance measurement instrument is bound to fail to produce good results; in other words, such results cannot be expected to be accurate in the same way, as the main source is not accurate. Ideally, the focus of the performance measurement instrument is on the development of performance in terms of each departmental need and the requirements of each job (Erasmus et al, 2011:284).

The research findings indicate that that the performance appraisal instrument in the Department

of Home Affairs is invalid, which is something contrary to what Erasmus et al (2011:272) mention when they say that validity deals with the question of what and how well the instrument correctly measures what it is supposed to measure.

Another important finding of this research is that a source of conflict between managers and subordinates could be attributed to the perception of unfairness. Additionally, the performance appraisal process is unfairly conducted and also perceived negatively. In this regard, Kumaran and Sangeetha (2013:28) are of the opinion that employees who have a negative perception, consider the system as biased, not properly implemented and not an appropriate way to evaluate employee's perception towards work performance. Unfairness affects employees' perception towards work performance and generates poor performance, as such employees tend to be unmotivated and as a result they cannot achieve the institutional objectives as outlined in the departmental strategic plan. The Department of Public Service and Administration mandated government departments to outline performance agreements of individual employees based on a departmental strategic plan, in order to measure institutional training priorities and individual training goals and objectives and the functional plans of the individual components. Thorpe and Halloway (2008:70) maintain that institutional objectives should be linked to the manager's roles and responsibilities. It was also found that subordinates work as a team in the accomplishment of certain tasks and once a supervisor treats a member of a team unfairly, that in actual sense demolishes the team spirit that has already been established. This is because they will think that amongst them there are those who are being favoured and those who are not.

Indeed, if subordinates or employees who do not perform but receive higher scores at the expense of the performing employees, the performing employees are likely to perceive the system as weak and continue with poor performance levels, because the underperforming employees are inappropriately rewarded for poor performance. At the same time, the performance levels or motivation of deserving and qualifying employees could deteriorate tremendously. Supervisors could make subordinates feel that they are useless assets of the department due to their prejudices, which is demonstrated by unfairness towards them. Moreover, the finding indicates that employees are dissatisfied with the manner in which the performance appraisal process is managed in the Department of Home Affairs.

Research findings reveal that the performance appraisal is accompanied by absence of constructive feedback which also creates tension between managers and their subordinates. Constructive feedback carries with it a notion of communication which should prevail between managers and their subordinates; it is very difficult and impossible to separate the performance

appraisal process from communication. Thorpe and Halloway (2008:72) describe communication in terms of a meeting between a manager and a subordinate who arrive together at an understanding of what work is to be accomplished, how work is progressing towards the desired results and whether or not the performance has achieved the agreed upon plan. The researcher has learned that there are some employees who have been in the employ of the Department of Home Affairs for more than ten years and those who are nearing the retirement age, without ever receiving feedback about their performance. They end up not knowing where to improve so that they could also be considered for performance bonuses. A performance appraisal process promotes giving feedback to employees for development purposes (Makamu & Mello, 2014:107). The Department of Home Affairs should consider encouraging proper communication between managers and their subordinates. Timely and constructive feedback is a valuable instrument that can assist managers to distinguish between poor and good performers. Constructive feedback is based on observation of work-related behaviours, actions, statements and results. Failure to give constructive feedback is a serious obstacle that encumbers and discourages employees from getting improved performance results.

Situational factors can negatively influence the accuracy of the performance appraisal. Mention has already been made that performance appraisal should be as accurate as possible. If it is not accurate as expected, it will lead to stress, sexual and racial bias. Similarly, leadership style characterises individual managers in the way they manage their sections within the DHA. It is important to note that leaders as managers should lead by example and not display an autocratic character that employees find difficult to cope with. They should be approachable at all times, especially when employees encounter any work-related problem. They should be available to resolve it with ease.

Research findings reveal that employees are not pleased with the fact that sometimes there are insufficient funds for rewarding good performers. This may lead to tension between managers and their subordinates. Appraising and managing work performance can be made easier by making the necessary funds available to encourage good performance. Pay progression and financial rewards should not be ignored when managing good performance. Erasmus et al (2011:289) mention that managers should recognise specific achievements of individual employees as well. The Department of Home Affairs should always make funds available in order to reward the performance of employees. It should not spend money for activities that are not budgeted for to avoid manager-subordinate conflict in relation to performance appraisal.

Controversial and equivocal performance standards and targets are also problematic,- as subordinates may not know what to achieve and according to what specific timeframes.

Performance standards should be clear, achievable and agreed upon with each individual employee. Ambiguous performance standards give rise to high volumes of disputes that become prevalent in the workplace especially in the Department of Home Affairs. Lussier (2003:250) maintains that a manager has to ensure that employees know exactly what the standards are and should be able to clarify them in order to minimise possible performance appraisal disagreements. In this regard, clear performance standards determine whether employees have achieved the expected institutional objectives or not. If the institutional objectives were not achieved, the onus rests with the managers and supervisors to review past performance to try to determine what the causes of the employee's underperformance could be.

Research findings show that employees are also anxious about a scarcity of resources in the Department of Home Affairs. According to the Public Service Regulations (2001), lack of resources diminishes the ability of employees to meet set standards. Without the necessary resources, the performance rating and appraisal would be incomplete, because there would never be any accomplishment of tasks and the problem that remains would be to determine on which basis the performance was rated. In other words a lack of resources can lead to the non-successful completion of tasks.

It has emerged from this study that subordinates are not informed beforehand that they should prepare all the evidence required to prove that they have achieved a performance bonus. Based on the above statement, it can be deduced that some subordinates are only informed on the day upon which the management has decided that employees' performance are to be appraised. According to Van Dijk and Thornhill (2003:465), performance agreements should be completed during assessments periods only, and should take place on a quarterly basis. More often than not, research participants are concerned with the timing of appraisals which happens unexpectedly. Therefore, a notice should be given well in advance that on such a particular day that their performance will be appraised, which includes, but is not limited to, the completion of performance appraisal forms. Makamu and Mello (2014:106) highlight that employee performance rewards are based on evidence of contributions made by employees towards the accomplishment of goals according to the employer's expectations.

It has been revealed that there is an unbalanced distribution of tasks within the Department of Home Affairs. Employees who are on the same salary level should perform tasks that are equal as guided by their job description. Consequently, if managers and supervisors find it difficult to balance the delegation and distribution of tasks, they should consider rotating employees to different tasks, in order to avoid the lodgement of grievances that may occur.

The other important finding is that the performance agreements that subordinates are expected to sign are not clear. Performance agreements should be clear in order to avoid any misconception from subordinates about the performance contract they are entering into. As put forward by Erasmus et al (2005:465), performance of an employee should be managed according to a performance agreement. An employee entering into such a performance agreement is also consenting to have his/her performance reviewed by a supervisor in charge. The purpose of the performance agreement is to define key responsibilities of the job with the aim of encouraging improved communication and provide appropriate support.

5.2.4 Research objective 4: Influence of conflicts or disagreements on the performance appraisal process

It has been discovered that the performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs is characterised by polarised relations between managers and subordinates. It is for this reason that employees tend to be reluctant to perform above the norm and show no particular interest in performance appraisal. Conflicts lead to a tense or polarised relationship between managers and their subordinates. This is the reason why subordinates do not give respect as expected, or they are not performing as expected because of the conflict which negatively influences the performance appraisal. Erasmus et al (2011:274) believe that performance appraisals result in bad confrontations between managers and their subordinates, which cause them to have limited face-to-face contact with each other. As part of the empirical objectives, the above research objectives were achieved and dealt with in the preceding chapter and it can be concluded that both the literature and empirical objectives were successfully achieved. Manager-subordinates conflicts negatively influence the performance appraisal process due to the collapse of the relationships between the two, which eventually leads to poor morale and high levels of absenteeism from employees.

Research findings show that poor morale is also a result of manager-subordinate conflict in the Department of Home Affairs. In instances where manager-subordinate conflict has been allowed to happen, employees are demoralised and certain tasks are not completed. This shows that manager-subordinate conflict negatively influences performance appraisal. Clearly, the manifestations of an unethical employment relationship between a manager and a subordinate is a symptom that reduces the morale of public servants and negatively influence the overall performance, not only of employees, but also the entire public sector institution.

Research findings indicate that the current performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs poses a challenge. This is due to the fact that it creates unnecessary delays

when employees complete their performance appraisal forms, and the delays also have a negative impact regarding the payment of performance bonuses. To a large extent, managers should design performance appraisal forms that are easy to comprehend and not time-consuming to fill out.

Research findings also reveal that manager-subordinate conflict influences the performance appraisal process because employees start to develop a negative attitude. Once the subordinates become negative of the entire process, job performance is negatively affected, which also result in a dropping of productivity levels.

5.3 DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMS

Several problems arose during data collection. The discussion of these problems allows the researcher to identify and deal with any weakness that is involved in this study. The researcher encountered various challenges or problems during the data collection and data analysis stages. Data collection problems include too little data that was acquired from some research participants, which the researcher remedied by having an extended sample, so that the best responses could be utilised.

The second problem was that there were various interruptions concerning employees who were not incorporated as research participants in this study. Some claimed that they were looking for some files which were kept in the office where interviews were taking place. It is advisable for managers and supervisors to allocate an office which is not busy for a conducive and fruitful interview process or discussion.

Furthermore, some of the employees who volunteered to participate in this research study withdrew on the day before interviews and that was beyond the researcher's control, as participating in this study was not compulsory but voluntary. Essentially, this caused the study to have serious limitations due to also limited empirical data. The researcher never compelled anyone to participate in order to comply with research ethics code.

The researcher further experienced a situation where other office managers influenced their subordinates not to participate in this research study, but subordinates insisted to participate irrespective of whatever circumstances. The researcher's assumptions were that the managers were perhaps afraid that employees might not reach their daily targets as expected. This posed a great disappointment, as the researcher thinks that subordinates are the victims that have more to say regarding the management of performance appraisal. Another problem is that, when observing the behaviour of research participants and recording them, some research

participants paused from giving responses until I finished recording and after that they proceeded.

Besides the above experiences, the data analysis was successfully completed, although there were few research participants who could not express themselves well. To a very large extent, some of the responses that were given were not clear, which caused the researcher to think deeply as regards to what they wanted to say, in order to put meaning to their accounts. In general, all the research participants were treated with respect, even those who withdrew from participating.

5.4 CONCLUSION

In the final analysis, this study was conducted within the Department of Home Affairs Tshwane area. The researcher has interviewed participants who are employees (both managers/supervisors and their subordinates) of the Department of Home Affairs in the Tshwane area located in the Akasia Regional office, the Pretoria Regional office (Byron Place), the Garankuwa (Odi) District Office, Mamelodi Medium Office and Soshanguve North Medium Office. It is essential to note that the findings presented in this study should not be generalised across all the Departments of Home Affairs outside the Tshwane area, but are strictly applicable to the above-mentioned areas.

The study cautions the managers and supervisors about the sources of manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements that negatively influence the performance appraisal process within the afore-said department. In this instance, there are reported cases of poor morale that becomes a barrier for the effective management of the performance appraisal process.

Generally, a review of both theoretical and empirical research indicates that the management of the performance appraisal process is ineffective. Consequently, the main findings are such that manager-subordinate conflict or disagreement is a result of biased ratings that accompany employee performance appraisals. Research participants are dissatisfied with the manner in which performance bonuses are paid to non-deserving employees by managers and supervisors to their most favoured colleagues. They also expressed their dissatisfaction regarding the allocation of high scores to some employees who are underperforming, which accelerate conflicts between managers and subordinates in the Department of Home Affairs.

The current study contributes to the body of literature by exploring the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisals. Subsequently, performance appraisals should be conducted accurately in order to improve employees' job performance.

Managers and supervisors should fairly rate employees, without the element of bias so that the manager-subordinate conflict could be dealt with. The study has achieved what it set out to do as described in chapter 1.

The main features of an ineffective performance appraisal process are an inconsistent and inaccurate performance measurement instrument which defeats the whole purpose of appraisal. Managers and supervisors should appraise employees' performance impartially, fairly, equitably and without bias in order to avoid any conflict that may arise in the workplace. In order to achieve this, they need to prioritise payment of performance bonuses to deserving employees, rather than to their favoured colleagues who do not perform.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Based on the identified research findings regarding the sources of manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements during the performance appraisal phase, the researcher deemed it of vital importance to make the following implementable recommendations:

- The Department of Home Affairs should consider and prioritise offering training and development to managers and supervisors who are vested with the responsibility of managing performance appraisal of individual employees in order to perform optimally.
- It is recommended that the performance appraisal committee should also include a union representative who will ensure that the entire process of moderating the performance appraisal runs smoothly.
- It is further recommended that both managers and supervisors should be equipped with conflict management and resolution skills which will help them to deal with conflict in the workplace when it arises.
- There should be a balanced distribution of tasks by managers and supervisors in order that some subordinates or employees do not feel that they are being over-worked. Should there be a need, employees should be rotated on an interval to be decided upon by the latter.
- The departmental wellness programmes should be extended in order to assist employees who find themselves in stressful situations during working hours as a result of poor leadership style that negatively affect their performance in the long run.
- The payment of performance bonuses should be done to employees who achieved higher scores, based on their performance, as opposed to non-deserving or employees who do not qualify.

5.6 SUGGESTION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The following suggestion requires serious consideration. Research of this nature could be undertaken which focuses on areas not covered by this study, in order to arrive at the findings.

- A similar study could be undertaken in the Department of Home Affairs, particularly areas that do not fall within the Tshwane area.
- Future researchers are also encouraged to utilise different research methods such as quantitative surveys to investigate manager-subordinate conflict in relation to performance appraisal.
- Another important issue is that a related study could be undertaken to understand the influence of gender disparities on the performance appraisal process in public sector institutions.

5.7 REFERENCES

- Ahmad, R & Bujang, S. 2013. Issues and challenges in the practice of performance appraisal activities in the 21st century. *International Journal of Education and Research* 1(4, April).
- American Management Association, nd. *The Performance Appraisal Process: An Overview*, pages 1-24. Available from the internet. Accessed on August 19, 2017.
- Anderson, GC. 1993. *Managing performance appraisal systems*. London: Blackwell.
- Anellis, M. 1996. Grounded Theory Method: philosophical perspectives, paradigm of inquiry, and postmodernism. *Qualitative Health Research* 6(3, August):379–393.
- Armstrong, M. 2015. *A handbook of Performance Management, An evidence-based guide to delivering high performance*, Kogan Page Publishers: Great Britain and United States
- Armstrong, M. 2006. *Human resource management practice*. 10th edition. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Arogundade, OT, Temitope HO, A & Arogundade, AB. 2015. Performance appraisal knowledge: an implication on workplace commitment in a selected commercial bank in Lagos, Nigeria. *Ife Centre for Psychological Studies/Services* 23(1):98–106.
- Ayers, R. 2013. Building goal alignment in federal agencies' performance appraisal programs. *Public Personnel Management* 42(4):495–520.
- Ayers, R. 2015. Aligning individual and organizational performance: goal alignment in Federal Government Agencies' performance appraisal programs. *Public Personnel Management* 44(2):169–191.
- Babbie, E. 1989. *The practice of social research*. 5th edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Babbie, E. 1995. *The practice of social research*. 7th edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth
- Babbie, E. 1998. *The practice of social research*, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Babbie, E. 2008. *The basics of social research*. 4th edition (International student edition). Canada: Chapman University.
- Babbie, E. 2010. *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Babooa, SK. 2008. *Public participation in the making and the implementation of policy in Mauritius with reference to Port Louis' Local Government*. PhD thesis. Pretoria, University of

South Africa.

Bacal, R. 1999. Performance management. London: McGraw-Hill.

Bailey, MT. 1992. Do physicists use case studies? *Public Administration Review* 52(1):47–53.

Battaglio, Jr RP. 2015. Public human resource management, strategies and practices in the 21st century. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Baxter, P & Jack, S. 2008. Qualitative case study methodology: study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report* 13(4), Article 2.

Bekele, AZ, Shigutu, AD & Tensay, AT. 2014. The effect of employees' perception of performance appraisal on their work outcomes. *International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations* 2 (April September):136–173.

Belcourt, M, Bohlander, G & Snell S. 2011. Managing human resources. 6th Canadian edition. Toronto, Canada: Nelson Education.

Bendix, S. 2007. Industrial relations in South Africa. 4th edition. Lansdowne: Juta.

Boachie-Mensah, FO & Seidu, PA. 2012. Employees perception of performance Appraisal System: A Case study. *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol 7 No.2, January 2012.

Boshomane, LG. 2011. An alignment of the Emerging Management Development Programme (EMDP) to the Human Resource Development Strategy for the South African Public Service. MTech dissertation, Pretoria, University of South Africa.

Boswell, WR & Boudreau, JW. 2000. Employee attitudinal effects of perceived performance appraisal use. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 11(3):283–299.

Boxall, P, Purcell, J & Wright P. 2007. The Oxford handbook of human resource, Oxford University Press:USA.

Bryman, A. 2001. Social research methods. Lafayette County, MI: Oxford.

Brynard, PA & Hanekom, SX. 2006. Introduction to research in management-related fields. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Byrne, ZS, Pitts, VE, Wilson, CM & Steiner, ZJ. 2012. Trusting the fair supervisor: the role of supervisory support in performance appraisal. *Human Resource Management Journal* 22:129–

Cafrad, ACB. 2003. Performance management in the public service in the Republic Of South Africa: framework, progress and challenges, paper delivered at a workshop on Performance Measurement and Enhancement in the Public Sector, Gambia 26–30 May.

Camardella, MJ. 2003. Effective management of the performance appraisal process. Employment Relations Today Spring.

Cardy, RL & Leonard, B. 2011. Performance management: concepts, skills and exercises. 2nd edition. New York, NY: ME Sharpe.

Cascio, WF. 1998. Managing human resources, productivity, quality of work life, profits. 5th edition. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

CCH Editorial Staff. 1988. Employee assessment, appraisal and counselling. 2nd edition. Sydney: CCH Group Australia.

Champoux, JE. 2003. Organizational behavior, essentials tenets. Mason, OH: Thompson South-Western.

Chen, X. 2011. An assessment of the performance appraisal process in the public sector: a comparative study of local government in the city of Cape Town (South Africa) and Hangzhou City (China), Mdisertation: University of Western Cape.

Clemens, EV, Milson, A & Cashwell, CS. 2009. Using leader-member exchange theory to examine principal-school counselor relationships, school coueslors' roles, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. Professional School Counseling 13:75–85.

Coetzee, M & Schreuder, D. 2014. Personnel psychology, an applied perspective, Oxford University Press: Southern Africa.

Creary, SJ, Caza, BB & Roberts, LM. 2012. Out of the box? How managing a subordinate's multiple identities affects the quality of a manager-subordinate relationship. Academy of Management Review 40(4):538–562.

Creswell, JW. 1998. Qualitative inquiry and research design. London: Sage.

Cresswell, JW. 2013. Qualitative enquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Daley, DM. 1992. Performance appraisal in the public sector, techniques and applications.

Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood.

Dargham, NAS. Sa. Effective management of the performance appraisal process in Lebanon: an exploratory study, Maître de Conférences à la FGM.

Dawson, C. 2002. Practical research methods, a user-friendly guide to mastering research techniques and projects. United Kingdom: Oxford.

Decenzo, DA & Robbins, SP. 1999. Fundamentals of management: Essential concepts and applications: third edition, Upper saddle river, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Deluga, RJ & Perry, JT. 1994. The role of subordinate performance and ingratiation in leader-member exchanges. *Group and Organization Management* 19(1 March):67–86.

De Marrais, K & Lapan, SD. 2004. Foundations for research methods of inquiry in education and the social sciences. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Denzin, NK & Lincoln, YS. 2003. The landscape of qualitative research: theories and issues. New York: Sage.

Department of Public Service and Administration. 2007. Employee Performance Management and Development System, April. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Home Affairs: Integrated Performance Management and Development Policy for Non-SMS members.

Department of Home Affairs. 2012/2013. Annual performance report. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Dessler, G. 2003. Human resource management. 9th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Du Plessis, ESCT. 2015. Factors influencing managers' attitudes towards performance appraisals. MAdmin dissertation. Pretoria, University of South Africa.

Dusterhoff, C, Cunningham, BJ & Macgregor, JN. 2013. The effects of performance rating, leader-member exchange, perceived utility, and organizational justice on performance appraisal satisfaction: applying moral judgement perspective. School of Public Administration, University of Victoria, Australia.

English Oxford Dictionary, 2009. Luxury edition. London: Oxford University.

- Erasmus, B, Swanepoel, B, Schenk, H, Van der Westhuizen, EJ & Wessels, JS. 2005. South African human resource management for the public sector. Cape Town: Lansdowne.
- Erasmus, B, Swanepoel B, Schenk, H, Van der Westhuizen, EJ & Wessels, JS. 2011. South African human resource management for the public sector. 2nd edition. Cape Town: Lansdowne.
- Erdogan, B & Baver, T. 2015. Leader-member exchange theory. *International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences* 13:641–647.
- Farazmand, A. 2007. Strategic public personnel administration, building and managing human capital for the 21st century. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Farndale, E & Kelliher, C. 2013. Implementing performance appraisal: exploring the employee experience, human resource management, November-December 2013, vol. 52, no.6 pp. 879-897.
- Fisher, M. 1996. Performance appraisals. London: Kogan Page.
- Fleenor, CP & Scontrino, MP. 1982. Performance appraisal: a manager's guide. Dubuque, IA: Hunt Publishers.
- Gabris, GT & Mitchell, K. 1989. Merit-Based Performance Appraisal and Productivity: Do Employees Perceive the Connection? *Public Productivity Review*, Vol. 9. No. 4. (Winter). pp. 311-327. M.E. Sharpe Inc.
- Garner, JT. 2016. Open doors and iron cages: supervisors' responses to employee dissent. *International Journal of Business Communication* 53(1):27–54.
- Getnet, B, Jebena, T & Tsegaye, A. 2014. The effect of employees' fairness perception on their satisfaction towards the performance appraisal practices, a case study of University of Gondar. *International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations* 2, Issue 1:174–210.
- Grobler, P, Wörnich, S, Carrell, MR, Elbert, NF & Hatfield, RD. 2006. Human resource management in South Africa. 3rd edition. London: British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication data.
- Guba, EG & Lincoln, YS. 1994. Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In *Handbook of qualitative research*, edited by N Denzin & YS Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage:105–117.
- Harrington, JR & Lee, JH. 2015. What drives perceived fairness of performance appraisal?

- Exploring the effects of psychological contract fulfilment on employees' perceived fairness of performance appraisal in US Federal Agencies. *Public Personnel Management* 44(2):214–238.
- Haslam, SA, Van Knippenberg, D, Platow, MJ & Ellemers, N. 2003. *Social identity at work: developing theory for organizational practice*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Hendricks, CC & Matsiliza, NS. 2015. Management of employee performance in The South African Public Service: the case of the National Department of Rural Development and Land Reform in the Western Cape, problems and perspectives in management, volume 13, issue 3, 2015.
- Henning, E. 2004. *Finding your way in qualitative research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Henning, E, Van Rensburg, W & Smit, B. 2012. *Finding your way in qualitative research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Hofstee, E. 2006. *Constructing a good dissertation, a practical guide to finishing a Master's, MBA or PHD on schedule*. Sandton: EPE Publishers.
- Holbeche, L. 2005. *The high performance organisation: creating dynamic stability and sustainable success*. London: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Holzer, M & Schweser, RW. 2011. *Public administration, an introduction*. Washington: Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication data.
- Howell, JM & Merenda, KEH. 1999. The ties that bind: the impact of leader-member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 84(5):680–694.
- Hughes, OE. 2012. *Public management and administration: an introduction*. 4th edition. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Huysamen, GK. 1994. *Methodology for the social and behavioural sciences*. Halfway House: Southern Book.
- Janssen, O & Van Yperen, NW. 2004. Employees' goal orientations, the quality of leader-member exchange, and the outcomes of job performance and job satisfaction. *The Academy of Management Journal* 47(3, June):368–384.
- Jensen, J & Rodgers, R. 2001. Cumulating the intellectual gold of case study research, *Public Administration Review* 61(2, March/April).

- Kanyane, MH & Mabelane, MJ. 2009. Performance management and skills capacity in the government sector. *Journal of Public Administration* 44(1, March).
- Kirkpatrick, DL. 2006. Improving employee performance through appraisal and coaching. 2nd edition. USA: Library of Congress-in-Publication Data.
- Klingner, DE & Nalbandian, J. 2003. *Public Personnel Management, Contexts and Strategies*, Fifth Edition, Prentice Hall:USA.
- Kondrasuk, JN. 2012. The ideal performance appraisal is a format, not a form. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal* 11(1).
- Kroon, J. 1990. *General management*. 2nd edition. Cape Town: Pearson.
- Kumaran, S & Sangeetha, P. 2013. An empirical study on impact of employee's perception towards performance management system on employee motivation and job commitment, *International Academy Research, Journal of Business and Management*, Vol no.2, issue no.7, December 2013, page no. 20-34.
- Kumar, R. 2008. *Research Methodology*. New Delhi: India: APH Publishing Corporation.
- Kumar, R. 2014. *Research methodology: a step by step guide for beginners*. London: Sage.
- Leap, TL & Crino, MD. 1993. *Personnel/human resource management*. 2nd edition. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Leedy, PD & Ormrod, JE. 2005. *Practical research: planning and design*. New York: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Liden, RC, Sparrowe, RT & Wayne, SJ. 1997. Leader-member exchange theory: the past and potential for the future. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* 15:47–119.
- Liden, RC, Erdogan, B, Wayne, SJ & Sparrowe, RT. 2006. Leader-member exchange, differentiation, and task interdependence: implications for individual and group performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (27):723–746.
- Liff, S. 2011. Improving the performance of government employees, a manager's guide. USA: Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication data.
- Lockett, J. 1992. *Effective performance management: a strategic guide to getting the best from people*. London: Kogan Page.

- Long, CS & Kowang, TO. 2013. A review on performance appraisal system: an ineffective and destructive practice. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research* 14(7):887–891.
- Longenecker, CO, Liverpool, PR & Wilson, KA. 1988. An assessment of managerial/subordinate perceptions of performance appraisal effectiveness. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 2(4):311–320.
- Loseke, DR. 2013. *Methodological thinking, basic principles of social research design*. London: Sage.
- Lunenburg, FC. 2010. Leader-member exchange theory: another perspective on the leadership process. *International Journal of Management, Business and Administration* 13(1).
- Lussier, RN. 2003. *Management fundamentals, concepts, applications and skill development*. Canada: Thompson South-Western.
- Lussier, RN, 2006. *Management fundamentals, concepts, applications and skill development*. 3rd edition. Canada: Thompson South-Western.
- Luthuli, TB. 2009. From compliance to performance: a leadership challenge in the South African Public Service. *Journal of Public Administration* 44(3, September).
- Mabindisa, V. 2013. Impact of staff turnover on organisational effectiveness and employee performance at the Department of Home Affairs in the Eastern Cape Province, M. Dissertation, Durban: Durban University of Technology
- MacNabb, DE. 2013. *Research methods in public administration and non-profit organisations: quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Armonk, NY: Sharpe.
- Makamu, NI & Mello, DM. 2014. Implementing performance management development system in the Department of Education. *Journal of Public Administration* 49(1, March).
- Maley, JF. 2009. The influence of performance appraisal on the psychological contract of the inpatient manager. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management/SA Tydskrif vir menslikehulpbronbestuur*, 7(1), Art.#179, 10 pages.
- Manyaka, RK & Sebola, MP. 2012. Impact of performance management on service delivery in the South African Public Service, *Journal of Public Administration*, Volume 47(1.1, March).
- Markus, LH. 2004. *Performance management problems and potential, 12 key steps to ensure top performance from your staff*. New Zealand: Centranum.

- Martin, M & Whiting, F. 2003. Human resource practice. 6th edition. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, London: Sage.
- Marshall, C & Ross, GB. 2006. Designing qualitative research. 4th edition. London: Sage.
- Mathis, RL & Jackson, JH. 2003. Human resource management. 10th edition. Toronto: Thompson.
- Mcguire, D. 2014. Human resource development. 2nd edition. India: Sage.
- Meredith, J. 1998. Building operations management theory through case and field research, *Journal of Operations Management* 16:441–454.
- Miah, MDK & Talukder, AKMMH. 2012. The effects of employees' perceptions of performance appraisal process of readymade garments industries in Bangladesh: an empirical study. *Business Review* 7(1, January–June).
- Middlemist, RD, Hitt, MA & Greer, CR. 1983. Personnel management, jobs, people and logic. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Miles, MB & Huberman, AM. 1994. Qualitative data analysis: a sourcebook of new methods. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Miller, T, Birch, M, Mauthner, M & Jessop, J. 2012. Ethics in qualitative research. 2nd edition. London: Sage.
- Miller, GJ & Yang, K. 2008. Handbook of research methods in public administration. 2nd edition. New York: Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication data.
- Minnaar, F. 2010. Strategic and performance management in the public sector. 1st edition. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Mlambo, ZL. 2010. A performance management system in the office of the Premier of the Limpopo Provincial Government: a critical analysis. Potchefstroom: North-West University.
- Mofoluwake, AP & Oluremi, AH. 2013. Job satisfaction, organizational stress and employee performance: a study of NAPIMS, Centre for psychological studies/ services. *Ife psychologia*, 21(2), September 2013.
- Mondy, RW & Noe, RM. 1996. Human resource management. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Mouton, J. 1996. Understanding social research. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Mouton, J. 2001. How to succeed in your master's and doctoral studies: a South African guide and resource book. 1st edition. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Mouton, HC & Marais, HC. 1992. Basic concepts in the methodology of the social sciences. Revised edition. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

Munzhedzi, PH. 2011. Performance management system and improved productivity: a case of the department of local government and housing in the Limpopo province, M. dissertation: University of South Africa.

Munzhedzi, PH & Phago, K. 2014. Performance management system quandary in the public service: a case of the Limpopo Province, South Africa. Journal of Public Administration 49(4, December).

Naidoo, G & Kuye, JO. 2005. Service delivery in the South African Public Service: an overview from 1994 to 2003, Journal of Public Administration, Vol. no1.40, December 2005.

Nalbandian, J & Klingner, DE. 2003. Public Personnel Management, Contexts and Strategies, Fifth Edition, Prentice Hall:USA.

Nankervis, AR, Compton, RL & McCarthy, TE. 1992. Strategic human resource management, 3rd edition. Australia: South-Western.

Nathan, BR, Mohrman, AM & Milliman, J. 1991. Interpersonal relations as a context for the effects of appraisal interviews on performance and satisfaction: a longitudinal study, Academy of Management Journal, Vol.34, pp. 352-369.

Nel, PS, Van Dyk, PS, Haasbroek, GD, Schultz, HB, Sono, T & Werner, A. 2004. Human resource management. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Nicholas, H. 2007. Public administration and public affairs, 10th edition, Library of congress cataloguing in publication data, New Jersey.

Nigro, FA & Nigro, LG. 1976. The new public personnel administration. Illinois: Peacock.

Novit, MS. 1979. Essentials of personnel management. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Novit, MS. 1979. Essentials of Personnel Management, Prentice-Hall: USA

Ocheti, GN, Maronga, E, Muathe, R, Nyabwanga, SN & Ronoh, PK. 2012. Factors influencing

employee performance appraisal system: a case of the Ministry of State for Provincial Administration and Internal Security, Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Social Sciences* 3(20, September–October).

O'Faircheallaigh, C, Wanna, J & Weller, P. 1999. *Public sector management in Australia, new challenges, new directions*. Australia: MacMillan.

Paile, NJ. 2012. *Staff perception of the implementation of performance management and development system: Father Smangaliso case study*. Pretoria: University of South Africa .

Patel, DP. 2013. *Research methods in the social sciences*. India: Shree Niwas.

Pattanayak, B. 2001. *Human resource management*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

Pichler, S. 2012. The social context of performance appraisal and appraisal reactions: a meta-analysis. *Human Resource Management* 51(5, September–October):709–732.

Price, A. 2011. *Fundamentals of human resource management*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pulakos, ED. 2011. Why is performance management broken? *Industrial & Organizational Psychology, Perspective on Science and Practice* 4(2, June).

Ponterotto, JG. 2005. Qualitative research in counselling psychology: a primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science. *Journal of Counselling Psychology* 52(2):126–136.

Punch, KF 2014. *Introduction to social research, quantitative and qualitative approaches*. 3rd edition. London: Sage.

Radebe, PQ. 2015. Managers' perceptions of the performance appraisal system in a local municipality of Gauteng Province in South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 6(1, January).

Radebe, P & Surujlal, J. 2013. Municipal sports officers' perceptions of performance appraisal and relationship with satisfaction with the process. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance (AJPHERD)* (supplement 2, October):117–132.

Republic of South Africa. 1994. *Public Service Act 103 of 1994*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa. 1996. *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

- Republic of South Africa. 1997. White Paper on Human Resource Management. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 1997. White Paper on Transforming Public Service Delivery, Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 1998. Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council Resolution No 13 of 1998. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 2000. Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council Resolution No 9 of 2000. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 2001. Public Service Regulations, Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 2007. Department of Public Service and Administration: Employee Performance Management and Development System (EPMDS). Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Ritchie, J & Lewis, J. 2003. Qualitative research practice, a guide for social science students and researchers. London: Sage.
- Robson, C. 1993. Real world research: a resource for social scientists and practitioner researchers. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Robson, C. 2002. Real world research. 2nd edition. Hoboken, NJ: Blackwell.
- Robinson, I. 2006. Human resource management in organisations, the theory and practice of high performance. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, London: Sage.
- Rolle, C & Klinger, D. 2012. Performance appraisal systems as a strategic human resource management tool in the Bahamian Public Service. *International Journal of Public Administration* 35:303–314.
- Roltades, AC. 1995. Performance management, a business process benchmarking approaches. UK: Chapman and Hall.
- Ross, A. 2015. Trust as a moderator of the effect of performance evaluation style on job-related tension: A research note, *accounting, organizations and society*, volume 19, issue 7, October 2015, pages 629-635.
- Rowe, WG & Guerrero, L. 2013. Cases in leadership. 3rd edition. London: Sage.
- Sangweni, SS. 2007. Toolkit for the management of poor performance in the Public Service

Commission, December.

Sanders, MS. 1975. Employee performance evaluation and review: a summary of the literature, Naval ammunition Depot: Indiana.

Sanders, W & Pinhey, T. 1983. The conduct of social research. Rome, Italy: CBS College MCSER Publishing.

Schriesheim, CA, Castro, SL & Cogliser, CC. 1999. Leader-member exchange (lmx) research: a comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data-analytic practices. *Leadership Quarterly* 10(1):63–113.

Schyns, B. 2006. The role of implicit leadership theories in the performance appraisals and promotion recommendations of leaders, *equal opportunities International*, 25(3), 188-199.

Sebashe, SS & Mtapuri, O. 2011. Implementation of a performance management system: a case study of Ba-Phalaborwa Municipality in Limpopo, volume 44 no.4 December 2011.

Sekaran, U. 2003. Research methodology for business: a skill building approach. 4th edition. New York: John Wiley.

Seotlela, RPJ & Miruka, O. 2014. Implementation challenges of performance management system in the South African mining industry. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5(7, May):177–187.

Shafritz, JM & Russel, EW. 2005. Introducing public administration. London: Pearson Education.

Shrivastava, A & Purang, P. 2011. Employee perceptions of performance appraisals: a comparative study on Indian banks. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 22(3, January):632–647.

Sikula, AF. 1976. Personnel administration and human resources management. Canada: Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication data.

Silverman, D. 2005. Doing qualitative research. 2nd edition. London: Sage.

Singh, A. 2013. Perception of software professionals regarding performance appraisal process: An exploratory study, *vikalpa*, volume 38 No. 2 April-June 2013.

Singh, S. 2012. A comparative study of performance appraisals, incentives and rewards practices in domestic and multinational enterprises in the country of Brunei Darussalam, The

International Journal of human resource management, volume 24, 2012-issue 19.

Smith, HW. 1981. Strategies of social research: the methodological imagination. 2nd edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Smith, HW. 1991. Strategies of social research. 3rd edition. Philadelphia, PA: Saunders College Publishers.

Sollinto, M, Martin, MM, Dusic, S, Gibbons, EK & Wagenhouser, A. 2016. Assessing the supervisor-subordinate relationship, involving part-time employees. International Journal of Business Communication 53(1):74–96.

South Africa. 2001. Public service regulations. Pretoria: Government Printers.

South Africa. 2007. Public Service Commission, Report on the management of poor performance in the public service, Pretoria: Government Printers.

Spangenberg, HH. 1993. Understanding and implementing performance management. Cape Town: Juta.

Stone, RJ. 2008. Managing human resources. Australia: John Wiley and Sons.

Sudin, S. 2011. Fairness of and satisfaction with performance appraisal process, Journal of Global Management, July 2011, Volume 2. Number 1.

Sumelius, J, Bjorkman, I, Ehrnrooth, M, Makela, K & Smale, A. 2014. What determines employee perceptions of HRM process features? The case of performance appraisal in MNC subsidiaries. Human Resource Management 53(4, July–August):569–592.

Swanepoel, S, Botha, PA & Mangonyane, NB. 2014. Politicisation of performance appraisal. South African Journal of Human Resource Management, volume 12(1), Art #525 pp. 1-9.

Tashakkari, A & Teddlie, C. 2003. Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioural research. London: Sage.

Thani, XC. 2009. The research methods of completed doctoral research output in public administration from 2000 to 2005, MAdmin dissertation, Pretoria, University of South Africa.

Thorpe, R & Holloway, J. 2008. Performance management: multidisciplinary perspectives. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Thurston, Jr PW & McNall, L. 2010. Justice perceptions of performance appraisal practices. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 25(3):201–228.
- Tlowana, MP. 2009. An evaluation of performance appraisal for supervisors in the Department of Agriculture Sekhukhune District, Limpopo Province. MAdmin dissertation, Polokwane, University of Limpopo.
- Torrington, D, Hall, L, Taylor, S & Atkinson, C. 2009. *Fundamentals of human resource management*. London: Pearson Education.
- Tripodi, T. 1988. Qualitative research methodologies. *Management* 12(1).
- Tyson, S & York, A. 1996. *Human resource management*. London: British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication data.
- Tyson, S. 2015. *Essentials of human resource management*. 6th edition. London: Routledge.
- Van As, M & Van Schalkwyk, M. 2000. *Research and information management IV and research methodology, public management and development*. 1st edition. Florida: Technicon, South Africa.
- Van Breukelen, W, Schyns, B & Blanc, P. 2006. Leader-member exchange theory and research: accomplishments and future challenges, *Journal of leadership*, vol 2(3):295–316.
- Van der Riet, M & Durrheim, K. 2006. Putting design into practice: writing and evaluating research proposals. In *Research in practice: applied methods for the social sciences*, edited by M Terre Blanche, K Durrheim and D Painter, Cape Town, South Africa: UCT Press:80–111.
- Van der Walldt, G. 2016. *Managing for excellence in the public sector*. 3rd edition. Lansdowne: Juta.
- Van der Walldt, G. 2004. *Managing performance in the public sector*. Lansdowne: Juta.
- Van der Walldt, G & Du Toit, DPF. 1999. *Managing for excellence in the public sector*. Lansdowne: Juta.
- Van der Wal, C. 2012. Transparency as a dimension of ethics in performance appraisal, MAdissertation, Johannesburg, University of Johannesburg.
- Van der Westhuizen, E, Wessels, J, Swanepoel, B, Erasmus, B, Van Wyk, M & Schenk, H, 2011. *South African human resource management for the public sector*. 2nd edition, Cape Town: Juta.

- Van Dijk, HG & Thornhill, C. 2003. The use of performance management systems to ensure an integrated approach to human development. *Journal of Public Administration* 38(4, December).
- Van Hoek, L & Schultz, CM. 2014. Importance and improvement of manager-employee relationships in a natural resources mining company in Africa. *Journal of Contemporary Management* 11:385–405.
- Walters, M. 1995. *The performance management handbook*. Melksham, UK: Wiltshire.
- Wang, H, Law, KS & Chen, ZX. 2008. Leader-member exchange, employee performance and work outcomes: an empirical study in the Chinese context. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 19(10, October):1809–1824.
- Wang, H, Law, SK, Hackett, RD, Wang, D & Chen, ZX. 2005. Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Academy of Management Journal* 48(3, June).
- Welman, JC & Kruger, SJ. 2001. *Research methodology for the business and administrative sciences*. 2nd edition. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Welman, B, Kruger, B & Mitchell, B. 2005. *Research methodology*. 3rd edition. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Werther Jr WB & Davis, K. 1996. *Human resources and personnel management*. 5th edition. Washington: Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication data.
- Wessels, JS. 1999. *Research in public administration. Reflective public administration: views from the South*, edited by JS Wessels & JC Pauw. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Wessels, JS, Pauw, JC & Thani, XC. 2014. *Reflective public administration: context, knowledge and methods*. 1st edition. Pretoria: University of South Africa Press.
- Williams, RS. 1998. *Performance management, perspectives on employee performance*. London: International Thompson Business Press.
- Wilson, JP. 1999. *Human resource development, learning and training for individuals and organizations*. London: Kogan.
- Wilton, N. 2011. *An introduction to human resource management*. London: Sage.
- Zainal, Z. 2007. Case study as a method. *Jurnal Kemanusiaan* 9 (June) Faculty of Management and Human Resource Development, University of Technology, Malaysia.

Zongozzi, JN. 2015. Case studies in South African public administration master's dissertations in the period 2005 to 2012. MAdmin dissertation, Pretoria, University of South Africa.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR OPERATIONAL STAFF MEMBERS

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR OPERATIONAL STAFF MEMBERS

1. To what extent do you regard the performance appraisal process as a consistent and stable measure of performance in the Department of Home Affairs?
2. How well does the performance appraisal instrument measure your performance?
3. To what extent does the performance appraisal instrument assess your actual roles and responsibilities associated with your position?
4. To what extent do you think judgmental biases (supervisor/manager biases) influence the appraisal process?
5. To what degree do you receive constructive feedback from your supervisor during the performance appraisal process?
6. In your view, do you think situational factors (eg stress, sexual and racial biases, leadership styles, etc) can influence the accuracy of the performance appraisal? Please substantiate your answer.
7. In your opinion, what do you think could be the causes or reasons for manager-subordinate conflict during performance appraisals?
8. With regard to manager-subordinate conflict during the performance appraisal process, to what extent do you think these conflicts can affect the performance appraisal process?
9. What do you think should be done to prevent any conflict in relation to performance appraisal in the Department?
10. What factors could lead you to disagree with your manager or supervisor during performance appraisal process?
11. Would you like to add any information in relation to this interview?

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING!

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS

1. To what extent do you regard the performance appraisal process as a consistent and stable measure of performance in the Department of Home Affairs?
2. How well does performance appraisal instrument measure employee performance in the Department?
3. To what extent does the performance appraisal instrument assess the actual roles and responsibilities of an employee?
4. Do you believe that your subordinates can trust you to assess their performance fairly and objectively? Please substantiate your answer.
5. To what degree do you give constructive feedback to your subordinates during the performance appraisal process?
6. In your view, do you think that situational factors (eg stress, sexual and racial biases, leadership styles, etc) can influence the accuracy of the performance appraisal? Please substantiate your answer.
7. In your opinion, what do you think could be the causes or reasons for manager-subordinate conflict during performance appraisals?
8. With regard to manager-subordinate conflict during the performance appraisal process, to what extent do you think that these conflicts could affect the performance appraisal process?
9. What do you think should be done to prevent any conflict in relation to performance appraisal in the Department?
10. What factors do you think could lead you to disagree with your subordinate during the performance appraisal process?
11. Would you like to add any information in relation to this interview?

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING!

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET FOR OPERATIONAL STAFF MEMBERS

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET FOR OPERATIONAL STAFF MEMBERS

Title: The management of performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs: the case of Tshwane area

Dear Prospective Participant

My name is Jeremiah Phathela and I am doing research under the supervision of Mr. P Hlongwane and Mrs MM Mashamaite, lecturers in the Department of Public Administration and Management towards a Masters' Degree at the University of South Africa. We are inviting you to participate in a study: "The management of performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs: the case of Tshwane area".

I am conducting this research to to explore the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisal in the Department of Home Affairs in Tshwane area. The researcher obtained the contact details of the prospective participants at the National Department of Home Affairs. The prospective participants were chosen because they can provide with the information as well as the first hand experiences on the management of performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs. At least ten (10) managers/supervisors who are responsible for applying the performance appraisal instruments are invited to partake in this study. Also, fifteen (15) operational staff members are invited in order to incorporate their perspectives.

The study involves semi- structured interviews that will last for 30-35 minutes in order to explore the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisal in the Department of Home Affairs in Tshwane area. The interview will be undertaken at your workplace at your most convenient time. Statement that participation is voluntary and that there is no penalty or loss of benefit for non-participation. Participating in this study is voluntary and you are under no obligation to consent to participation. If you do decide to take part, you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a written consent form. You are free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason.

The study is intended to empower managers/supervisors in their leadership role in managing performance appraisal systems and concomitant obstacles. Again, it will enhance employee understanding of the purpose of performance appraisal and challenges associated with it. Moreover, the study will describe and explain the extent to which manager-subordinates conflict affect the performance appraisal process within the Department of Home Affairs. There is no risk involved, however the researcher is going to utilise their time which might cause some

discomfort or inconvenience to participant who have busy schedule.

The researcher will assure the participants that anything that will be discussed during the research would be kept confidential and would not be used for purposes other than this study. The recordings that will be made during the research process will ensure that the whole discussion is captured and provide complete data for analysis. This means that cues that will be missed the first time can be recognized when listening to the recording good quality transcribing will include tone and inflection, because only a small portion of the message is communicated in actual words.

Participants will be assured that all information that would be provided by them would be strictly confidential and that their identities would not be revealed in any record or report and that there would be no link between the data and the participants. To ensure this, codes or pseudonym will be used to ensure anonymity.

The researcher and the supervisor will have access to your answers and may be reviewed by people responsible for making sure that research is done properly, including the transcriber, external coder, and members of the Research Ethics Review Committee. Otherwise, records that identify you will be available only to people working on the study, unless you give permission for other people to see the records. Hard copies of your answers will be stored by the researcher for a period of five years in a locked cupboard/filing cabinet for future research or academic purposes. Electronic information will be stored on a password protected computer. Future use of the stored data will be subject to further Research Ethics Review and approval if applicable. Hard copies will be shredded and/or electronic copies will be permanently deleted from the hard drive of the computer through the use of a relevant software programme. The researcher will use Unisa policy on how to destroy the electronic data. There will be no payment or reward for the study. This study has received written approval from the Research Ethics Review Committee of the Unisa and Department of Public Administration and Management and the College of Economic and Management Sciences Ethics Review Committee. A copy of the approval letter can be obtained from the researcher if you so wish.

If you would like to be informed of the final research findings, please contact Mr Jeremiah Phathela on 0726016793 44019742@mylife.unisa.ac.za or jeremiah.phathela@dha.gov.za. The findings are accessible for period of 6 months. Should you require any further information or any aspect of this study, please contact the researcher on the above contact numbers.

Should you have concerns about the way in which the research has been conducted, you may contact Mr. P Hlongwane, the Supervisor, on 0124298499 hlongp@unisa.ac.za. Alternatively,

contact the research ethics chairperson, Professor M Van Heerden, contact no: 012 429 6749, email address: vheerm@unisa.ac.za.

Thank you for taking time to read this information sheet and for participating in this study.

Mr Jeremiah Phathela

Researcher

APPENDIX D

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET FOR SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET FOR SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS

Title: The management of performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs: the case of Tshwane area

Dear Prospective Participant

My name is Jeremiah Phathela and I am doing research under the supervision of Mr. P Hlongwane and Mrs MM Mashamaite, lecturers in the Department of Public Administration and Management towards a Masters' Degree at the University of South Africa. We are inviting you to participate in a study: **"The management of performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs: the case of Tshwane area"**.

I am conducting this research to to explore the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisal in the Department of Home Affairs in Tshwane area. The researcher obtained the contact details of the prospective participants at the National Department of Home Affairs. The prospective participants were chosen because they can provide with the information as well as the first hand experiences on the management of performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs. At least ten (10) managers/supervisors who are responsible for applying the performance appraisal instruments are invited to partake in this study. Also, fifteen (15) operational staff members are invited in order to incorporate their perspectives.

The study involves semi- structured interviews that will last for 30-35 minutes in order to explore the manager-subordinate conflicts or disagreements in relation to performance appraisal in the Department of Home Affairs in Tshwane area. The interview will be undertaken at your workplace at your most convenient time. Statement that participation is voluntary and that there is no penalty or loss of benefit for non-participation. Participating in this study is voluntary and you are under no obligation to consent to participation. If you do decide to take part, you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a written consent form. You are free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason.

The study is intended to empower managers/supervisors in their leadership role in managing performance appraisal systems and concomitant obstacles. Again, it will enhance employee understanding of the purpose of performance appraisal and challenges associated with it. Moreover, the study will describe and explain the extent to which manager-subordinates conflict affect the performance appraisal process within the Department of Home Affairs. There is no

risk involved, however the researcher is going to utilise their time which might cause some discomfort or inconvenience to participant who have busy schedule.

The researcher will assure the participants that anything that will be discussed during the research would be kept confidential and would not be used for purposes other than this study. The recordings that will be made during the research process will ensure that the whole discussion is captured and provide complete data for analysis. This means that cues that will be missed the first time can be recognized when listening to the recording good quality transcribing will include tone and inflection, because only a small portion of the message is communicated in actual words.

Participants will be assured that all information that would be provided by them would be strictly confidential and that their identities would not be revealed in any record or report and that there would be no link between the data and the participants. To ensure this, codes or pseudonym will be used to ensure anonymity.

The researcher and the supervisor will have access to your answers and may be reviewed by people responsible for making sure that research is done properly, including the transcriber, external coder, and members of the Research Ethics Review Committee. Otherwise, records that identify you will be available only to people working on the study, unless you give permission for other people to see the records. Hard copies of your answers will be stored by the researcher for a period of five years in a locked cupboard/filing cabinet for future research or academic purposes. Electronic information will be stored on a password protected computer. Future use of the stored data will be subject to further Research Ethics Review and approval if applicable. Hard copies will be shredded and/or electronic copies will be permanently deleted from the hard drive of the computer through the use of a relevant software programme. The researcher will use Unisa policy on how to destroy the electronic data. There will be no payment or reward for the study. This study has received written approval from the Research Ethics Review Committee of the Unisa and Department of Public Administration and Management and the College of Economic and Management Sciences Ethics Review Committee. A copy of the approval letter can be obtained from the researcher if you so wish.

If you would like to be informed of the final research findings, please contact Mr Jeremiah Phathela on 0726016793 44019742@mylife.unisa.ac.za or jeremiah.phathela@dha.gov.za. The findings are accessible for period of 6 months. Should you require any further information or any aspect of this study, please contact the researcher on the above contact numbers.

Should you have concerns about the way in which the research has been conducted, you may

contact Mr. P Hlongwane, the Supervisor, on 0124298499 hlongp@unisa.ac.za. Alternatively, contact the research ethics chairperson, Professor M Van Heerden, contact no: 012 429 6749, email address: vheerm@unisa.ac.za.

Thank you for taking time to read this information sheet and for participating in this study.

Mr Jeremiah Phathela

Researcher

APPENDIX E

UNISA ETHICAL CLEARANCE LETTER

DEPARTMENT: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT
RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Date: 10 May 2017

Ref#: PAM/2017/010 (Phathela)
Name of applicant: Mr J Phathela
Student#: 44019742

Dear Mr Phathela

Decision: Ethics Clearance Approval

Name: Mr J Phathela, 44019742@mylife.unisa.ac.za, tel: 072 601-6793

[Supervisor: Mr P Hlongwane, 012 429-8499, hlongp@unisa.ac.za]

Research project: The management of performance appraisal process in the Department of Home Affairs: The case of Tshwane Area **Qualification:** MADMIN

Thank you for the application for **research ethics clearance** by the Department: Public Administration and Management: Research Ethics Review Committee, for the above mentioned research. Final approval is granted for the duration of the project. You are, though, required to submit a letter from the Department of Home Affairs, in which permission is granted to you to do this research, to this Ethics Committee within **30 days** of the date of this letter.


The decision will be tabled at the next College RERC meeting for notification/ratification.

For full approval: The application was **expedited and reviewed** in compliance with the Unisa Policy on Research Ethics by the RERC on 10 May 2017. The proposed research may now commence with the proviso that:

- 1) The researcher will ensure that the research project adheres to the values and principles expressed in the Unisa Policy on Research Ethics.
- 2) Any adverse circumstance arising in the undertaking of the research project that is relevant to the ethicality of the study, as well as changes in the methodology, should be communicated in writing to this Ethics Review Committee. An amended application could be requested if there are substantial changes from the existing proposal, especially if those changes affect any of the study-related risks for the research participants.
- 3) The researcher will ensure that the research project adheres to any applicable national legislation, professional codes of conduct, institutional guidelines and scientific standards relevant to the specific field of study.

Kind regards


Prof Mike van Heerden
Chairperson:
Research Ethics Review Committee
vheerm@unisa.ac.za


Prof MT Mogale
Executive Dean: CEMS

APPENDIX F

PERMISSION LETTER FROM THE NATIONAL DEPARTMENT OF HOME AFFAIRS



home affairs

Department:
Home Affairs
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

230 Johannes Ramokhoase Street. Private Bag X114, Pretoria, 0001
Parliamentary Office, 120 Plein Street. Private Bag X9048, Cape Town, 8000

Enquiries: Nomakholwa Makaluza, Tel: 012 406 7281, Email: Nomakholwa.makaluza@dha.gov.za

Mr Jeremiah Phathela
House No. 2639
Rosslyn Gardens, Ext 45
Pretoria
0200

Dear Mr Phathela

Re: Request for Permission to conduct interviews with the DAH staff members and their line managers for a study on "The management of performance appraisal process in the DHA: The case of Tshwane area".

Your research request to conduct interviews with the DHA staff members and their line managers for a research study on "The management of performance appraisal process in the DHA: The case of Tshwane area" has a reference. The Research, Information and Knowledge Management unit acknowledges the above request.

The DHA, through the Research, Information and Knowledge Management unit has approved your request to conduct research in the department to fulfill the requirements of your research project. The approval is based on your submission of all required documents.

It is our understanding that the interviews will be conducted using the interview guide submitted to the department to ensure that the security of the department is not compromised. Upon completion of your studies, the DHA requests that you furnish the departmental Information Resource Centre with a copy of your research report, which can be shared with the entire departmental staff.

I wish you all the best in your studies.

Regards

Signature:

Deputy Director-General: Human Resource Management & Development

Date: 27/05/2017.